

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XI

APRIL, 1926

No. 2

EDITORIAL

BLESSED IS THE PREACHER OR TEACHER WHO IS GIFTED with both the comprehension of the great underlying principles of the Christian message and the power of expressing them clearly and impressively. Not only do people need such deliverances, but just now there is an unusual eagerness to hear and read them. The prospect open to sound exposition of the Scriptures should be most attractive to every preacher who is a devout Bible student.

Twice in the more recent past we have published articles by an expositor of the kind here referred to, Principal McNicol of the Toronto Bible College. His monograph, *The Essential Reality in Christianity*, given in these pages a year and a half ago, is still in demand. It is a privilege to submit in this number another of this writer's illuminating studies, *The Kingdom of Heaven in the Mind of Jesus*.

The subject is approached by first clearing away certain false conceptions as to what Jesus taught concerning the Kingdom of Heaven. Then, after a few words upon the way He proceeded to lay the foundation of the Kingdom, Mr. McNicol devotes a section to such a fine study of the inner life of our Lord that it would

make a valuable article in itself. It especially stresses Jesus' use of the Scriptures, His dependence upon the Holy Spirit, and His habits of prayer. The paper closes with an answer to the question, "How was the Kingdom to come in the world?"

The application of what is set forth ought to vitalize and revolutionize the life and work of many a preacher and Christian leader.

IN THE ISSUE OF THIS QUARTERLY FOR JANUARY, 1925, the initial article, by Dr. Poteat, *The Death of Jesus*, attracted unusual attention, and a request has since been granted to translate it into Portuguese. In that paper our Lord's death was treated under three heads, as an event, as a deed, and as a doctrine.

In the present issue, under the same title, Dr. Poteat handles his great theme in a different way. Paying little attention to its speculative aspects, but confining the study rather to the experience of believers, he deals with the great facts involved in redemption from sin as they impinge upon the inmost thought and conscience of men.

After explaining his standpoint, the writer introduces a number of incidents which illustrate reconciliation in the experience of human relationships. He then proceeds "to distill the essence common to them all, and to inquire what help these afford us in understanding our reconciliation to God in the death of His Son."

Then follows a study of the points in Paul's statement, "We are reconciled to God through the death of his Son." Here, at the outset, is made clear the distinction between offenses against men and sin against God. The divine estimate of sin and man's "instinctive assent" to the meaning of violation of the moral law are

shown in their common relation to the whole question of reconciliation. The paper closes by putting strong emphasis upon the fact that "Jesus is God's estimate of sin written in characters of His own life's crimson."

The whole treatment is based on the great facts of God's holiness, the offensiveness of sin, the infinite Love that takes the initiative in bringing the sinner back to its embrace, and the responsibility resting upon the soul in its decision respecting the atonement wrought by Jesus Christ upon Calvary.

EVERY TRUE PREACHER OF THE GOSPEL IS EAGER TO take advantage of whatever will help him to prepare the best possible sermons. The best human source of aid is doubtless the exceptionally successful preacher. It is for this reason that we have given several articles by Dr. G. Campbell Morgan on various phases of the sermon problem. He has in former issues considered the essentials of a sermon and the text, and now he comes to The Central Message of the Sermon. The whole series comes under Biblical Homiletics.

Every point treated is important, and might easily serve as the theme for an entire article. They include, defining the purpose, kinds of sermons, arranging the plan, the work on the text, constructive work, and divisions.

If one of these subdivisions is to be especially commended to the sermonizer, it would be the short section under the subhead, The Work on the Text. Failure at this point is one of the chief reasons why we have so many lecturers and essayists in the pulpit, instead of real preachers.

We hope to give a further paper on the sermon, the special theme being the introduction and conclusion.

IN HIS SERIES OF PAPERS UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT times, Dr. Sihler has reached the question of Greek Religion at the Beginning of the Christian Era.

The omission of the definite article at the beginning of this caption is itself not without a suggestion of the nature of the subject dealt with, which is soon justified in the discussion.

Two ideas especially impress one with their significance as he follows the author in this illuminating paper. One is the futility of seeking to associate classical Greek thought and life with the loftiest ideals. Again it is soon realized that Greek religion was not a single uniform faith, but rather a group of religious ideas and traditions more or less related. "The overwhelming mass of the people," says Dr. Sihler, "were interested in specific or regional worship." Considerable attention is devoted to establishing this fact, and the study is carried beyond Greece proper, into the Hellenistic world.

This survey forms another of those fine monographs in each of which Dr. Sihler gives a clarifying view of some phase of the life of ancient times.

THE BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS ISSUE COVER A VARIETY of fields and include these titles:

Jesus of Nazareth.—Klausner.

The Four Gospels.—Streeter.

The Early Church and the World.—Cadoux.

The Psychology of Religious Mysticism.—Leuba.

Science as Revelation.—Watson.

An Elementary Christian Psychology.—Norlie.

R. M. K.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IN THE MIND OF JESUS

By REV. JOHN McNICOL, B. D., Principal Toronto Bible College.

JESUS began His public ministry with the announcement that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. Throughout the whole course of His ministry He had the Kingdom of Heaven in view. When it came to a close He was able to declare, in the prayer which summed up His life, "Father . . . I have glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do." The Kingdom of Heaven had not come, and there was no visible sign that it was any nearer than before His ministry began. And yet it is evident that in the mind of Jesus lay the conviction that He had done something which would bring the Kingdom into being and establish it upon the earth.

I

Did Jesus refer to His teaching and example? Did He mean that He had stated and illustrated the principles of the Kingdom so fully during the course of His ministry that if men would only follow out His teaching now in the light of His example the Kingdom of God would be realized on earth? Did He conceive that to be the work which had been given Him to do? It is true that Jesus explained the principles of the Kingdom and expounded its laws in a great variety of ways, but on no occasion did He declare that men would be able to establish the Kingdom on earth by following

these principles and obeying these laws. His teaching about the Kingdom does not give the impression that He had this object in view.

Jesus presented the Kingdom as something which men had to enter, not as something which He expected them to establish. In the Sermon on the Mount, where the laws of the Kingdom were expounded with the greatest fulness, He went on, toward the end, to call upon His hearers to enter by a narrow gate, a gate so narrow that few would find it. This entrance into the Kingdom, He declared elsewhere, was not an easy thing. It was easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God. It required a complete revolution of life, a revolution which even His disciples had not yet passed through. "Except ye turn," He told them once, "and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." This revolution was so radical a change as to be a new beginning of life, for except one was born from above he could not even see the Kingdom of Heaven. It is clear, therefore, that Jesus did not expect the Kingdom to come by the dissemination of His teaching among men and its adoption as a standard of life and conduct throughout the world.

Did Jesus refer to the work He had accomplished in gathering and training His disciples? Did He expect them to bring the Kingdom of Heaven into being through their united efforts by the force of His own influence operating upon their lives and by the driving power of the new ideas He had given them? Was the work given Him to do the organization of a body of men who would carry on His teaching and influence after He was gone, until they succeeded in getting the Kingdom of God set up in the world?

This was not the impression the disciples received from their Master, for they did not proceed to carry out any enterprise of this kind. The first thing that happened when Jesus was taken from them was the breaking up of the apostolic company. The disciples were all scattered, evidently helpless and bewildered. When they were reunited, and when the apostolic band was restored, it was not upon the basis of anything Jesus had done or taught up to this time, but because of the new and unexpected event of His resurrection. Notwithstanding all the teaching and training Jesus had given the disciples, at the end of His public ministry, so far from being able to go out into the world and manifest the Kingdom of God among men, they were obviously incapable of undertaking anything. And when they did go out into the world afterwards it was to proclaim the facts of their Master's death and resurrection.

Jesus had never given the disciples any indication that He intended to establish His Kingdom on earth by means of their efforts. This was not the purpose for which He had called them. They were to follow Him; they were to be with Him; they would become fishers of men. They would be members of His Kingdom, and would even sit on thrones in it; but nowhere did He even suggest that the coming of the Kingdom would depend upon anything they were going to do. He did not use them for that purpose during His ministry. When He sent them out two by two throughout the land it was to proclaim the same message He had been proclaiming, that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, and to do the same kind of works He was doing. Through them He was simply multiplying His own message and ministry for the time being. Even when

He looked forward to what they would do after His departure, it was with the same thought in mind. Their work would be to represent Him in the world. "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. . . . As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world." He did not anticipate a different kind of welcome for them from that which the world had given Him. He gave them no expectation of ever making such an impression on the world as would win the world's allegiance. He warned them against getting the idea that they were leaders among men. "Neither be ye called masters (*καθηγηται*); for one is your Master, even the Christ" (Matt. 23: 10). He was not training leaders, but servants. It is evident, therefore, that Jesus did not look for the coming of the Kingdom through the efforts of His disciples and through any leadership they might be able to exert in the world.

No, Jesus did not propose to establish the Kingdom of Heaven upon human obedience to any moral standard, even of His own setting, or upon the human efforts of any organization of men, even of His own choosing. Not upon such insecure and shallow foundations did the Lord leave His task when He went to His death. The Kingdom must be rooted and grounded upon far deeper and more abiding work. Human nature itself must first be changed at its source, and its whole course and tendency must be reversed. This was what Jesus had accomplished. He had accomplished it by living a human life on earth Himself. His was the one life ever lived since the fall in which the will of God alone was done from the beginning to the end.

In the fall of Adam the nature of man had lost its true center. It no longer had its springs in God. Ever after that it was moved by self-will and not by the will

of God. Even in the case of the saints of the Old Testament, though they did the will of God, the course of their lives had a bias. Their very obedience bore the marks of the deep-seated injury caused by the fall. The law of God itself, as given to them, was set in prohibitions. But in the case of Jesus it was altogether different. In Him righteousness was positive and complete. His human life was entirely free from self-will and from any personal bias caused by self-will. Its springs were in God, and in God alone. Throughout its whole course it reflected the will of God perfectly. Within the narrow confines of human existence, and subject to all the limitations of human life, Jesus had created human nature anew. This was what He had accomplished, and it was by first accomplishing this that He proceeded to lay the foundation of the Kingdom of God among men.

II

To see the significance of this we shall need to examine the inner life of our Lord. There are two remarkable passages in the Epistles which seem to draw the veil aside and give us a glimpse of what lies behind the mystery of the incarnation. In Philippians 2: 5-8 Paul traces the descent of the Lord of glory from His original place of equality with God step by step down through all the stages of His humiliation among men. In doing this the apostle would have us see the mind which was in Christ Jesus all along the way. He had "emptied himself." He had put aside the manifestation of His own proper glory and the assertion of His own divine nature. He did this at the beginning, and He maintained this attitude of mind to the end. In other words, He denied Himself in becoming man, and as man He continued to deny Himself and to be obedient to the will

of God alone, even to the length of giving Himself up to death on the Cross. Self-denial was the inner principle of our Lord's whole earthly life.

In Hebrews 10:5-9 the writer quotes a passage from the 40th Psalm as spoken by Christ and as expressing His purpose in coming into the world. "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body didst thou prepare for me." What the sacrifices and offerings of the Old Testament only represented typically and could not secure as a reality, that is, full surrender of man's life to God, Christ undertook to accomplish. In order to accomplish it He became man, and on coming into the world as man He declared that His purpose was to dedicate human life to God. "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." Complete denial of self in the one case, complete obedience to God in the other—these were the primary and fundamental principles of our Lord's incarnation.

These two features marked the life of Jesus from the very beginning. His first recorded words in the Gospel story are significant for the light they throw backward upon His early years (Luke 2:49). Commentators are divided as to whether Jesus meant that He was to be found in His Father's house, or about His Father's business. The marginal note of the Revisers shows that they, too, were in doubt as to which rendering should be given to the indefinite phrase of the original Greek, "in the things of my Father." The point cannot be decided by usage, both translations being linguistically correct.

The context alone can help us to get at what was in the mind of Jesus. There is His own surprise, on the one hand, at His parents' anxious search for Him, and their wonder, on the other, at His reply, the significance

of which they did not fully understand. The surprise which Jesus expressed was based upon something about Him which He thought they should have been familiar with—"Knew ye not?" This could not have been His Messianic consciousness, for, although it may be quite true that the whole incident implies that Messianic consciousness had now begun to arise in the soul of Jesus, that was not something which they could have known. Nor was it the supernatural nature of His birth that was in His mind. A reference to this circumstance in addressing His parents would rob His words of their ingenuous, childlike character, while it would fail to account for the impression of deep, lingering wonder produced upon them.

Neither of these suggestions, then, can account for the words of Jesus. They are a disclosure, rather, of His inner soul from the time of His earliest consciousness. The story is a natural and beautiful revelation of the mind of the growing boy. Under the power of the new impressions He had been receiving during the feast, and in the midst of the sacred services of the temple, there had broken upon the apprehension of the child some consciousness of His divine Sonship. This was what absorbed Him so much, but it was not to this that He referred. Behind it, and leading up to it, back through all the twelve years lived in the home in Nazareth, was the constant attitude of the child's soul. He had never had any interests of His own to engage Him. He had always been occupied with the concerns of God. Wherever He was, and whatever He was doing, He was "in the things of his Father." This was what His parents might have known. Here, then, is revealed the inner life of a child who had no self-will. Here is human nature pure from the start, conscious of never having

been anything but right with God, and occupied with doing His will.

This attitude of mind was maintained when Jesus entered upon His public ministry. "I came down from heaven," He declared, "not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (John 6:38). This cannot mean what it would mean in the case of any other man, that the will of Jesus was different from His Father's will, and that He put aside the one and chose to carry out the other. It is the action of His will and not its content that is in view. He willed to have no self-will, but to make the will of God His will. The whole motive purpose of His mission in the world was to do the will of God without having any interests of His own.

This was the point of His argument with the Jews in the controversy which followed the Sabbath miracle at the pool of Bethesda (John 5). "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing" (v. 19). He has so emptied Himself, He means, that He does nothing of His own will. Because the Son does nothing but what He sees the Father doing, the Father shows Him all that He does, that the Son may have equal honor with the Father (vs. 20-23). It was therefore on the very ground that He had emptied Himself, and had no interests of His own but only the interests of His Father, and was not carrying out His own will but only His Father's will, that, as the Son, He claimed equality with the Father. It was on this ground, too, that He based His right to judge. "I can of myself do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (v. 30). Having no interests of His own to bias Him, and not being moved

by His own will, His judgment was that of His Father alone.

The will of God which Jesus came to do was not a program already laid out before Him. He found it in the Scriptures, and it opened up before Him as He went along. The Word of God was the rule of life for Jesus. As a man He consented to order His life in accordance with a revelation already given to men. Whenever He was challenged concerning any of His actions He made the Scriptures the ground of His defense. Though He claimed to be the Son of God and to have equal honor with the Father, yet He never appealed to the secret counsels of God which, as the Son, He might have been expected to know. Nor did He ever appeal to His own inner consciousness of what the will of God should be. Never do we find Jesus vindicating Himself on merely subjective grounds, irrespective of the written Word. When He purged the temple of its unholy traffic, though this act involved an assumption of Messianic claims, yet He did not justify it on the ground of His Messianic authority, but by a reference to the Word of God. "It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer." When His disciples were charged with violating the Sabbath law, Jesus defended them on the ground of a principle which He found in the Scriptures. "Have ye not read what David did?" When a practical question of life and conduct was referred to Him, He directed His enquirer to the Word of God—"What is written in the law? how readest thou?" Thus Jesus invariably turned to the recognized revelation already in the hands of men, and in the Scriptures He found the mind and the will of God, just as other men might do.

This seems to have been the central point on which

Satan assailed Him in the wilderness. The suggestions of the adversary were not directly aimed at getting Jesus to abandon His Messianic task, but toward getting Him to change the attitude in which He would carry it out. They were suggestions to shift His ground and to find the guiding principle of His action within Himself. Behind all the mysterious experience of those forty days there was a subtle attempt of the devil to introduce the element of self-will into the work of Jesus. In every case Jesus refused to have the question referred to Himself. On every point He brought an explicit declaration of the will of God from the written Word into the field to settle it.

Even in His teaching, where the authority of Jesus seems unique and independent, that very authority He Himself based upon the Word of God. He was very explicit in His declaration of the infallible and irrefragable authority of the Scriptures. "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets," He declared, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17). And then He proceeded to expound some of the laws in the most sweeping and searching way. He penetrated to their inner and spiritual meaning. He showed that they reach to the thoughts and intents of the heart, and that when the law of God condemns an act it thereby condemns the motive which prompts the act. This was not the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. This was not their traditional teaching of the Law; and it was their traditional teaching of the Law, and not the Law itself, that Jesus put aside.

It is true that in two cases, the law of oaths and the law of retaliation (vs. 33, 38), Jesus seemed to set aside entirely an Old Testament commandment on His own authority. But even here He was not claiming the

right to supersede the Scriptures with His own teaching; He was carrying the spirit and principle of the Law to a further stage of development. The old command introduced a temporary limitation of the principle of love to God and to one's neighbor which Jesus found to be the essence of the Law, a limitation made necessary because of the perverted moral sense of the people, in the same way as the law of divorce had been allowed because of the hardness of their hearts (Matt. 19: 8).

In no case, then, can it be said that Jesus separated Himself from, or placed Himself above, the authority of the Scriptures. On the contrary, He yielded His mind and His will to them; He meditated upon them; and He brought out of them the mind and will of His Father in Heaven. Thus it was that Jesus produced the impression of speaking "with authority," so different from the scribes. They could only pass on their learned traditions about the Law. The teaching of Jesus illumined the Law with a sense of reality. The divine authority behind the Scriptures lived again on the lips of Jesus. In Him the Word of God was transparent.

Not only did Jesus find the will of God for Himself in the Word of God as given to men, and not in His own personal consciousness; He also did the will of God in dependence as a man upon the power of God, and not by His own inherent power as the Son of God. He denied Himself the use of His own personal power in carrying out His task, and surrendered Himself completely to the Spirit of God. This was the significance of His baptismal experience. All the evangelists tell us how the Holy Spirit came upon Jesus at His baptism. Luke's narrative of the events that followed immediately afterward goes on to indicate how this experience influenced His life. "And Jesus, full of the Holy

Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led in the Spirit in the wilderness" (4:1). "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit unto Galilee" (4:14). Speaking in the synagogue at Nazareth, He chose the passage in Isaiah which begins, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (4:18), and applied it to Himself and to His own ministry. Thus we see Jesus dedicating Himself to His mission in full dependence upon the Spirit of God, responding at once to the leading of the Spirit, entering upon His work in the power of the Spirit, and publicly declaring that this was the nature of His ministry.

After this Luke drops all reference to the Holy Spirit, and in all the four Gospels there are only two further statements regarding the place of the Spirit in the life of Jesus. Why so much reference to the Spirit's connection with our Lord's work at the outset of His ministry, and scarcely an allusion to it afterwards? The explanation is not far to seek. After the Gospel writers had shown how Jesus entered upon His ministry under the influence of the Spirit of God, and how He was working and teaching in the fulness of the Spirit, it was quite unnecessary for them to dwell any further upon the fact. There was no need of mentioning the Holy Spirit in any particular case when nothing Jesus did or said was of Himself alone. The two further statements in the Gospels confirm this. In Matthew 12:28 we have the Lord's own explanation of His miracles implied in the statement, "If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you." And in John 3:34 what He speaks is declared to be the very words of God for the reason that the Spirit had been given to Him without measure.

This dependence upon the Spirit and power of God was maintained by communion with God in prayer. The prayer life of Jesus was different from anything ever seen before. It was one of the most remarkable features of His ministry. It was not merely an expression of religious life, as in the case of the Old Testament saints. It was not a mere habit of prayer. It was the background of all He did and said. It pervades the Gospel records like an atmosphere. There was a great consciousness of God in the life of Jesus. The presence of God was as real to Him as the presence of the people among whom He was working. He would often withdraw from the multitudes, and even from His own disciples, and go away into the wilderness or up on the mountain side to spend time alone in communion with God. But He would also turn aside in the midst of some public incident to speak to His Father for a moment while the crowds were thronging around Him. His access to God was immediate and His fellowship with God was intimate.

This intimate access to God, however, was always marked by an attitude of dependence. Jesus hung upon God in prayer, and the power to carry on His ministry as He went along came out of His life of prayer. Even His miracles were answers to prayer. This fact becomes all the more evident from the indirect and unexpected way in which He occasionally referred to it. When the disciples called His attention to the fig tree which had withered away after His curse upon it, Jesus made no reference to the nature of the miracle, but used it as an illustration of faith and of answered prayer (Mark 11:22-24). When He stood before the tomb of Lazarus and was about to call back into life a man four days dead, He first lifted His face in thanksgiving

to God because He had been already heard (John 11: 41). The power to perform this miracle, the greatest of all His works, was given Him in answer to an unrecorded prayer.

This, then, was the kind of life Jesus lived on earth. He was the Son of the Highest and the Lord of Glory; but this life of His was lived within the strict and narrow limits of human experience. While it was a human life, it differed from any other human life ever seen on earth. It was a life on earth ruled from Heaven. Here at last was human nature with all its springs in God, and with all its activity responding to the will of God. Here at last the will of God was functioning in the nature of man.

When the Pharisees asked Jesus on one occasion when the Kingdom of God was coming, He replied that it was not coming "with observation." There was no visible sign such as they were looking for. There would be no sudden and startling demonstration of it. "For lo," He went on to say, "the kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (Luke 17: 21 marg.). Jesus did not mean that the Kingdom was within them in the sense of being in their hearts, for that was not true of the Pharisees. Nor was He referring to His disciples, for, as we have already seen, the Kingdom was not yet manifest in them. He could only be referring to Himself, and to the life He was living among them. In Him the Kingdom of God had come.

III

But how was the Kingdom to come in the world? How could that which had been accomplished in the life of Jesus be realized in the lives of other men? This

brings us to the mystery of the Cross. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit" (John 12: 24). These words were spoken by Jesus just at the close of His public ministry. Some Greeks who had come up to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, from the world outside Israel, had asked for an interview with Jesus. Their request brought Him face to face with the supreme crisis towards which His whole ministry had been moving, for before the message of the Kingdom could be given to the world the death of Christ must take place. "The hour is come," He declared, "that the Son of man should be glorified." The prospect filled His soul with conflicting emotions. "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour?" Is that what He will say? Will He make that His prayer? No—"but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name." And with this renewed resolve Jesus faced the final step in His self-denial that the consummation of the Father's will might be attained.

It was then there came, for the third time in His life, a voice from Heaven expressing the Father's approval upon Him. It is significant that each of these three occasions marked a crisis in which Jesus deliberately chose the Cross. The first occasion was at the Jordan, when He dedicated Himself to the Messianic task, and identified Himself with His people whom He undertook to redeem. The second was on the Mount of Transfiguration, when He turned back from the gateway of glory which had manifestly opened before Him, and instead of entering Heaven that way, went down into the world again to accomplish His departure ($\tau\eta\nu$ ἐξόδον αὐτοῦ, Luke 9: 31) in another way. The third occa-

sion was under the very shadow of the Cross. In reply to the Son's prayer came the Father's voice, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." These words doubtless refer, on the one hand, to what had already been accomplished in the life of Jesus, and, on the other hand, to what was now to be accomplished through His death.

Though the Lord evidently had His death in view from the outset of His ministry, He did not disclose the fact to His disciples till it was drawing toward the end. And when He did so He gave them a hint that they, too, were somehow involved in its significance. "If any man would come after me," He told them, "let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." This was a call to identify themselves with Him in the course He was taking. But what was implied in this they could not understand beforehand. A little later on He spoke of giving His life a ransom for many. Then in the upper room, during His farewell meeting with the disciples, He brought the announcements of His approaching death to a head when He instituted the memorial supper. "This is my body which is given for you. . . . This is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins." But not even yet could the disciples understand the real significance of His words. The Lord Himself recognized this when He said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

The resurrection of Jesus did not fully enlighten them, for on the eve of the ascension they asked Him if He was about to restore the Kingdom of Israel. The Lord's answer did not deny this expectation of theirs; there was an element of truth in their apocalyptic hope.

But their question revealed the fact that they were not yet aware of the essential nature of the coming Kingdom. Before the Kingdom of God could be manifested in any material form, its foundation must be established in a new spiritual order.

Then came Pentecost, and the meaning of it all broke upon the disciples as the light of a new day. It came both as a new revelation and as a new experience. Something happened which lifted them into another world. They found themselves in a new order of being. New powers were operating in their lives. Their risen Lord, who had entered Heaven with His complete and perfected humanity, had poured forth His Spirit upon them. The life that resided in Him was now communicated to them. What had been accomplished in His life on earth now began to be accomplished in theirs. The new nature He had created had taken its place in their natures. He was reproducing Himself within them, and they began to do the will of God, not by following an earthly standard, but by an inward power that came from Heaven.

The disciples now saw that by His death and resurrection Jesus had made the Kingdom of Heaven a reality on earth, for they had entered into it, and its laws were written on their hearts. Peter now knew what His Master meant when He said He would give Him the keys of the Kingdom. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost unlocked the mystery, and opened the doors for other men to come in. The disciples talked no more about the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel, but went out to carry the Gospel of the Kingdom to the world. Their message now was not that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand; they bore witness to the great supernatural facts upon which it was established.

In the center of these facts stood the Cross. In that supreme act of His sacrifice and denial of self Jesus had done something which redeemed the human race and reversed the course of human nature. He had gone down into death as the representative man, that a death might be accomplished also in those for whom He died the death of the old nature. He had been raised from the dead as the new man, the Head of the new race, that the new nature He had created might be imparted to them. Christ had thus made it possible for the will of God, which had functioned in His own life, to function also in the lives of other men. His people would now be willing in the day of His power. In the profound depths of that transaction upon Calvary He had laid, immovable and eternal, the foundations of the Kingdom of God upon earth.

His own exaltation to Heaven as a Prince and a Saviour and the coming of the Holy Spirit upon His disciples had brought into being the new spiritual system and made the results of the Cross available for men. This new spiritual system is the Kingdom of Heaven. It was this the Jews missed when they rejected Christ. "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." It was this the little band of disciples gained who followed Him. "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." It was this system Jesus had in mind in the parables in which He told of the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. It was a new order of life which He would bring into existence in the world, but which would not be of the world; which would run side by side with the world order until by another divine interposition He

would bring it to a triumphant consummation, and the Kingdom would be manifested in power and glory.

The Kingdom of Heaven is the present reality at the heart of Christianity. It is the unseen order of things which gives the visible church the ground for its existence. It is already established and needs no other foundation. The church's business is to proceed upon it and to proclaim it in all the world. It is the fundamental spiritual order of the new world that is to be.

TORONTO, CANADA.

THE DEATH OF JESUS

(Second Paper)

By EDWIN M. POTEAT

A FRIEND commenting on the first article on this theme¹ expressed his pleasure that I had not espoused any one of the "theories of the Atonement." I venture no opinion of their value for others when I say that books which begin with "historic theories of the Atonement"² do not help me. I have a curious feeling that they are starting me on the wrong track; that, in some way, they are erecting barriers between me and the facts. Is it not significant that the New Testament nowhere concerns itself to give a rationale of the reconciliation? "We were reconciled to God through the death of his Son" (Rom.5:10). Our inquisitiveness persists in asking, "But how?" Theories must be propounded, elaborated, defended, and then we take the road which runs straight to the jungle of speculation, and once in the tangle we may never again be in naïve contact with the reality we are trying to explain.

I

Let no one accuse me of obscurantism here. I am not saying that we may not ask questions like, "How does the death of Jesus save us?"³ nor am I implying that we must not reason about the Cross for the reason that it is unreasonable. That would involve one in the proposition that truth and fact do not match. The

¹ THE BIBLICAL REVIEW, January, 1925.

² For example, Macintosh, 1920.

³ H. C. Mabie, R. F. Horton, *et al.*

world of fact and the world of truth are not two worlds, but one. It remains true, however, as George Eliot said, "We may have very sublime feelings and very erroneous theories." Now, in religion, we are mainly concerned with adjustment to facts; here, the facts of God, of sin, of forgiveness. And my plea is that we must always hold firmly to the distinction between fact and truth—the one addressing our will and calling for adjustment, the other addressing our reason and calling for assent. Theories of religion are not religion. It is even possible to hold a correct theory of the reconciliation without being reconciled to God. The New Testament never shifts the emphasis—as we are so prone to do—from religion to theories of religion and steadily holds me to the view that the important thing is to have my heart healed of all estrangement toward God.

I recall two little girls. The parents of one were devout Christians, and wise withal, and when they reached the conclusion that she was old enough to stand the emotional strain of hearing the story of the crucifixion, they read it to her in the simple words of one of the Gospel narratives. That night, when she said her prayers, she broke away from her accustomed words, and said, "Dear Lord, I'm sorry for you; I wish you hadn't saved us."⁴ The other, who, at seven, had never heard of Jesus, was waiting in a hotel parlor and picked up a book from the table, a Bible, and began to read. She had opened to the story of the crucifixion. Her attention was seized. "Why," said she, "they are killing somebody here." As she sped rapidly through the story she saw how good Jesus was, how silent, and she grew eager to see that some one would appear take His part. And when no one appeared she cried out, "If I

⁴ Bushnell: Forgiveness and Law, *in loco*.

had been there I wouldn't have let them do it." I heard her tell this story, and at the time she was a flaming evangelist of the grace of God.

"Except ye be converted and become as little children ye can in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." The words sound like a direct rebuke of all our attempts at a "philosophy of the plan of salvation," and they fit in with the fact that the New Testament does not give us such a philosophy, probably because it rests upon a philosophy profounder than any we have yet conceived. Paul and John traverse vast ranges of thought, to be sure, but they never give us the impression that they are trying to convince us of the truth of their scheme of things; they never speculate. They report what they see and let it go at that. Some writers, indeed, picture Paul as engaged in an intense struggle to save his soul alive by working out a *modus vivendi* between his Christian experience and his rabbinic education. This seems to me to be a gross exaggeration of a temporary feature of his ministry, that to the Jews; while his experience of Christ is the permanent and towering reality. And however widely these writers range, on what seems an ever lengthening radius, their center remains the same. They never become dreamers; they feel always the pull of the central reality, and so remain religious men, "Christians," and never become philosophers, or even "theologians" in the modern sense of that word. I am convinced that it would surely be wisdom in us if we could follow their example.

I have thus far said that the best approach to the study of the death of Jesus is to leap over the centuries with their theories, and come directly to the experience of the first believers.

II

In what follows I propose to bring together a series of incidents. They are illustrations from our own times—some of them widely known—of reconciliation *in experience*. So far as I know they have never been brought together. Now, if theories of reconciliation may be misleading, illustrations may be more so. And yet, while realizing the risk of having my illustrations carry implications untrue to our reconciliation with God in Christ, I hope that since they are leaves from the book of experience they may throw some light on the center of the Christian religion, the death of Christ for our sins.

It is, of course, in the field of personal relations, and there alone, that instances of at-one-ment occur. Let me give one out of my own experience. For some disobedience which I cannot recall my mother once promised me a punishment. This set us in a distinct relation which I, a child, clearly understood. A week passed, and she had not administered the punishment. A month passed, and she had not kept her word. I suppose I thought of it every day and became convinced at last that she had forgotten all about it. Not so. A day came, perhaps six months after my disobedience, when we were alone in the house. We met where two wide halls came together; she took firm hold of the forefinger of my left hand, and without a word started toward the room, behind her own bedroom, where the switches were kept behind the big clock on the mantel. When we came out of that room I was convinced that my mother was a truthful woman, that she loved me, and at the cost of pain to both of us she was determined to hold me in right relations with herself. Her “passing over” of my offense brought her under suspicion of

leniency toward disobedience. I know of no other way by which she could have plucked that compromising suspicion out of my heart than by the deliberate exhibition of an integrity which could not leave disobedience unpunished (Rom. 3:23-26). The course she took established us in a reconciliation on the highest possible level, for it brought us together in a satisfaction of my conscience as well as hers, and made us happy in a mutual respect for the law under which the life of the family was maintained.

My next incident was related to me by the father in the case; and not long ago here in China, at the request of the mother of some of his grandchildren, I told the story in their presence. S. D. Gordon has, I believe, included it in one of his books of the Quiet Talks series.

One day the principal of the school the children attended called at the house to know if Charles was sick. "No," said the father, "but why do you ask?" "Well, he has been absent from school for several days." That morning Charles had left the house with his books and had come back at the usual hour, put his books down and gone out for play with no slightest betrayal in face or manner of the truancy he had been keeping up. When he came in again, his father called him into his den for very private interview. With a countenance in which suffering and tenderness were blended, the father said: "My son, my son! What have you done?" The boy had played his part in concealing his sin, so far as his own behavior was concerned, quite successfully. He came and went at the proper hours. He had been shrewd, but not shrewd enough. Is it not curious how we believe we can hide our sin? Charles had left out of mind the impression his absence would make on the

principal of the school, being wholly absorbed in the fun of playing truant. And he did not see the wide and complex relations in which he stood. One recalls De Quincey's comment on "the Knocking at the South Entry" in Macbeth the night of the murder of Duncan. He says the crime had so completely isolated Macbeth and his wife, so broken their connections with the whole social complex in which they stood, that Shakespeare had somehow to bring them back, make them aware of the external world, of other people in it, and he used the "knocking" to do this.

When he walked into his father's den Charles knew that he had been found out, yes, but also that he had not been alone in his wrongdoing; and before the interview was over he knew how deep a hurt he had inflicted on his father's heart. "Why, my boy, you have been living a lie in the presence of your father and mother; you have broken the happiness of our family life; you have given us a bad name at school." Now at last, he saw all this and felt it deeply. And when together they faced the question, what was to be done, he agreed with all his heart to what his father said: "You have been lying to the whole family. I think we shall have to fix it so you cannot communicate at all." And so the dear fellow was solemnly condemned to spend a week in an unfurnished room on the top floor of their home. That night the father, rolling restlessly in his bed, said, at length, "Mother, I can't sleep here with that boy on the hard floor upstairs alone." "Well, what are you going to do?" "I'm going up and sleep with him." And a few minutes later father and son were fast asleep, locked in each other's arms. The father spent the week sharing the lot to which his conscience and his love con-

demned his son; and when they came out of their prison together, they were reconciled for life.

In her life of Austin Phelps, her father, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps tells a somewhat similar story of her first lie, and how her benign father became terrible, as he pierced her soul with blazing eyes and said, "*My child, liars go to hell,*" and then burst into uncontrollable weeping. That was her last lie.

Take another instance. A beautiful family—father, mother, three children, brother nine, sister seven, and a baby sister two. The children enjoyed immensely a swing in the nursery. One day the father noticed that one of the ropes of the swing was frayed to the point of breaking, and he told the children not to swing that day. For some reason the rope was not mended, and the next morning the swing was very tempting. Yes, father had said not to swing, but one more try. So brother took a turn, then sister must have hers, and then, of course, baby sister must have her turn. But the first two had stretched the rope to the breaking point, and the baby was shouting with delight to go so high, when the rope broke and she was thrown in a heap against some furniture and lay helpless on the floor. Frightened, the children ran to tell mother. The doctor said "paralysis." And as their sister lay for months silent in her bed, the older children found no ease for the pain in their hearts for what they had done. Here was disobedience with tragic results. What must the father do? He decided not to punish the children. The reason he gave himself was that all that punishment might do for the brother and sister had been done by the affliction of the baby. And when he saw their distress he forgave them.

The next case is from a symposium on The Atone-

ment in *Modern Religious Thought*,⁵ published in 1901. "Schamyl was the great religious and military leader of the Caucasus who for thirty years baffled the advance of the Russians in that region and, after the most adventurous of lives, died in 1871. At one time bribery and corruption were so prevalent about him, that he was driven to severe measures. He announced that in every case discovered the punishment would be one hundred lashes. Before long a culprit was discovered. It was his own mother. He shut himself up in his tent for two days without food or water, sunk in prayer. On the third day he gathered the people, and pale as a corpse commanded the executioner to inflict the punishment, which was done. But at the fifth stroke he called 'Halt!' had his mother removed, bared his own back, and ordered the official to lay on him the other ninety-five with the severest threats if he did not give him the full weight of each blow."

I once told this incident to a woman, and with instant revulsion she protested, "If I had seen a man treat his mother that way I should have hated him the rest of my life." This immediate emotional reaction, natural to some temperaments, may indeed raise the question whether the General did not make a blunder in judgment in allowing the first five blows to fall on his mother; whether he was not mixing two methods of dealing with sin. If so, it is clearly an intellectual fault, not a moral. His moral appraisal of the situation was right; his heart was right; for he loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and he loved the sinner. And whatever his intellectual error, if there be one, he took the course which honored the law of righteousness for his camp, which put away

⁵ P. T. Forsyth, p. 87.

sin, and which restored the sinner to rectitude and peace.

My last illustration is from the life of Joseph Hardy Neesima. His escape from Japan in search of education, his meeting with Mr. Hardy in Boston, his education as Hardy's ward, his return to Japan, his rise to position and power in school work in his native land—these make up a thrilling romance of Christian missions in Japan. Neesima was once absent a day or so from school, and on his return found that a rebellion had broken out and the students were defying the administration. The master called an assembly in the chapel. When he came in he saw before him a silent, sullen crowd, ready to take the consequences of their rebellion, ready to explode in resentment at any proposition he might make toward a settlement. They were boys, boys in their teens, and their little black eyes flashed with determination to yield nothing. He began by explaining his conception of a Christian school, that principal, teachers, and pupils were tied together in one bundle of life, held together by mutual respect and love. He told them how he loved them, and how he was giving himself to them in the longing and in the belief that they would become good and useful men. "And now," said he, "you have broken our fellowship; you have sinned against the life of the school; one of us must suffer." When he said that, the pupils in their eyes shrank to a point in anger. If he had been a Westerner he might have said, 'One of you must suffer;' but being a true Oriental, with the East's fuller sense of corporate life, he said, "One of us must suffer." Selecting one of the older boys, a leader, he called to him to step from the first form into the area in front of the platform. The boy hesitated a moment, then rose and stepped forward.

Neesima had in his hand the ferule with which minor offenses were punished, and the boy supposed he had been called out to take the punishment for the school, and he was ready to fight rather than submit. Did he not have the whole school to back him up? But what was his confusion when, instead of striking him, the Principal, his face suffused with pity and his eyes brimming with tears, handed him the ferule and, stretching forth his left hand, required the boy to strike his open palm. Surprised by so strange and sudden a shift in their relations, the boy, covered with shame, refused; whereupon the master, taking the ferule, proceeded to strike his own left hand, blow after blow, till the palm was spurting blood. With every blow he broke hearts in the crowd before him. And when at last he stopped, their defiance had melted and in a tumult of confession and tears they begged to be forgiven, and they were.

III

Readers may note and pursue the implications of these accounts as they choose. What I prefer to do is to try to distill the essence common to them all, and to inquire what help these reconciliations afford us in understanding our reconciliation to God in the death of His Son.

1. Philosophers tell us that *Relation* is the mother of categories. "All thought has its origin in the relating activity of the mind."⁶ And we shall have to widen our view to the whole reach of philosophy before we rightly conceive the *relatedness* which underlies reconciliation. We must think on the scale of the universe. Paul does this in Colossians, where he makes *the Cross the center of the cosmos* (Col. 1:20). It is at this point and for this reason that our stories of individual experience fall short. They do indeed touch the fringes of

⁶ Fletcher: Introduction to Philosophy, Macmillan, p. 245.

the universal reality; they, so to speak, sample its quality and partake of its nature. But they are too atomic, too subjectivist, to furnish the norm for an eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12). Such a phrase—"eternal redemption"—drives us "back to before the foundation of the world, to a Redeemer who was there . . . whose redemption of the world is only possible because of His part in its creation, who took the responsibility of creating because He knew He possessed the power to redeem and retrieve whatever creation might come to."⁷

Now, in making the miracle of the redemption co-ordinate with the miracle of creation, Paul does not lose himself in a mist of speculative philosophy. See the first chapter of Galatians, with its tingling sense of an intensely personal dealing of God in Christ with *his lone soul*. It is in his reflections on this individual experience that he sees the lines of it expanding till they take in the universe. The little universe of individual experience suggests, though it cannot completely epitomize, the big universe of the cosmical reconciliation.

Here, then, is the first element of the distilled essence. It is the element of relation, relatedness. In each case of at-one-ment the offense was in a relation, and it poisoned the whole of the little universe in which the parties to it stood. We may for purposes of analysis conceive these universes as separate, but it is for analysis only; they do not break up the universe into a 'pluriverse.' And the point I am trying to make is, that if you look hard at the microcosm (the little world) you see the macrocosm (the big world);⁸ if you focus

⁷ Forsyth: *Justification of God*, p. 26; *cf.* p. 126.

⁸ Sir Henry Jones, in *Old Memories*, p. 131, tells us that Lord Kelvin was so full of his subject as to find infinite suggestion in practically any object that caught his eye. "I remember for instance that he lectured for a whole hour on broken glass—he had seen a broken window on his way to the classroom; and, as a matter of course, his exposition of his subject led him to bring in the whole solar system."

on the relations which were poisoned by the individual offense you see them expand to embrace infinity. Thus we see that sin spreads a blight over the whole moral order; and nothing is right or can be again until the infection is removed. In the case of my mother's postponed punishment, for example, my mind passed from approval and expectation of the punishment to a guess that she was careless, that she meant nothing in particular when she reproved us; then to a suspicion that she was really indifferent to disobedience, and this, in a maturer mind, might have grown to a doubt of a moral order in the world, that is, to a form of outright atheism. Thus a single act of disobedience of a child may, if it is not properly dealt with, empty the universe for that child of moral content and leave the throne of God empty. Now, of course, God cannot consent to be dethroned by sin and sinners. Denial, disloyalty must be changed to faith and love, and this on the scale of the total moral universe, if God is to keep His throne, that is, be God. We are now prepared for the statement that only One who is in the total moral order and who is committed to it as a whole, in whom it is constituted—only He can adequately feel the blight of sin's infection, only He can take its consequences, only He can restore the broken relation, the lost harmony, so making peace.

2. This brings us to the second of the common elements to be pointed out in our stories. The initiative in the reconciliation is always taken by the offended, never by the offender. The reason for this is plain; the offender will never take it. The element of wilfulness in sin, if it is not invariably present in the initial stages, quickly appears, and settles into stiffness; and by something like gravitation the wrongdoer goes steadily away from him whom he has wronged. If we

try to analyze his state of mind, we find he passes through the following stages: (a) Satisfaction—a pleasure-sense of escape, a feeling of emancipation from the restraints of the relationship, as no more bound by the obligations of friendship. Our truant schoolboy illustrates this phase, a tinge of mischief running through his satisfaction, as having outwitted both principal and parents. (b) But in cases of malicious wrongdoing, this phase passes quickly into settled dislike for the injured, into hatred indeed, and contempt for the former relationship. (c) Then come hardness —

But Oh, it hardens all within
And petrifies the feeling (Burns)—

hostility, implacability. Meantime other relations (friendships) have been established, and the wrongdoer conceives a strong suspicion of any approaches the injured man may make. 'He is seeking revenge.' He knows very well that he himself could not forgive so deep an injury as he has committed, and he cannot bring himself to believe that any man could genuinely desire a reconciliation under such circumstances. Thus the whole drift of his feelings gravitates heavily away from his old-time friend; and if he is left to take the initiative the old relation will never be restored.

Let us now look at the effects of the injury upon the injured man: (a) There is first distress at the breaking of the relation. (b) Then resentment which is a mixture of the sense of justice, respect for order (law), indignation at violation of relations (crime), and a dash of personal choler (anger). (c) In cases where the offense was unprovoked and the injured is entirely innocent of any share in the wrong done, and the injurer is thus guilty of premeditated and malicious injury, the injured man's resentment will be softened to pity, he

will ascribe the offense to inadvertence or misunderstanding of some sort, and he will wish to recover the injurer from his degradation. (d) And here the love which made the former relationship so sweet and beautiful awakes and begins with eagerness to devise ways to bring the injurer back into the old dear peace.⁹

This brief analysis makes it clear that reconciliation is forever barred unless the enmity can be blotted out, and that by him who has felt the injury as a personal affront and wrong.

Grace is the New Testament word for the love of God which takes the initiative in the reconciliation—the love that goes forth to repair the damage, *all the damage*, wrought by sin. “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the *sin of the world*” (John 1:29). “God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:8). “By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8).

3. The third element in our stories is *Forgiveness*, and forgiveness wipes off the old score. Here we meet a chorus of objectors. There is no forgiveness; none with nature, say the scientists; none with law, say the jurists; none with society, say the Pharisees; none with anybody, say the cynics. But we live by fellowship, and if broken fellowship may not be restored, if the handicap of a guilty past, of a stained conscience, may not be lifted, we are in an evil case indeed, and we must despair of getting forward at all. “If I am to go on living, I must find some cure for my sick conscience” (Ibsen). Now there is forgiveness with God; it is not written that He may be trifled with, but that He may be feared.

⁹ Cf. J. R. Seeley: *Ecce Homo*, chs. XXII and XXIII (Law of Forgiveness).

Our stories show a broken relationship, and the offended taking the initiative in restoring fellowship; they also show forgiveness, and suggest the terms on which forgiveness can be bestowed. The completed forgiveness is never possible until the wrongdoer has reached the state of forgivableness. However much the injured may long and strive for restored fellowship, an experienced forgiveness waits upon a change in the mood and attitude of the injurer. The quality of the change can best be indicated by saying that the injurer must come to feel about the injury in the way the injured feels. Fellowship means togetherness, oneness of feeling, not necessarily of judgment or opinion, but *particularly of feeling*, about life, about each other; and here a thousand subtleties of mutual understanding play happily. Now, in restored fellowship all these come back, and they come back into the realm of feeling. It means that the two parties are together again in their estimate of, and in their emotional response to, the wrong done.

Take Charles and his father, or Neesima and his school boys; they fell apart in their differing estimate and feeling about truancy, rebellion. They must get together *at the point where they fell apart*; they must come to feel the same way about truancy and rebellion. Attention must be focused exactly there. It will not do to look elsewhere. No loose and general acknowledgment of wrongdoing will suffice. Evasion of the specific wrong is intolerable, for it looks toward salving the hurt, not its cure.¹⁰ Rebellion in the school seemed a fine assertion of independence; it was a haughty adven-

¹⁰ "I know not a more presumptuous, a more unholy view of God, than this general trust in his placability, this loose reliance that we may draw to any extent upon his forgiving mercies—not up to the measure in which we seek to be one with Him, but up to whatever measure we may need to be forgiven" (John Hamilton Thom: *Laws of Life after the Mind of Christ*).

ture with exhilaration in it—so the boys felt, and there was doubtless a dash of curiosity to see how the “Old Man” would handle the situation. In its first phase the wrong had nothing distinctly ugly or mean or fierce. But by the time they were summoned to the assembly hall all these features had appeared, and they were as far as they well could be from seeing the affair as Neesima saw it; and feeling about it as he felt about it was even further away. What they saw as a declaration of independence, a proud adventure, he saw as a thrust at all authority. What they felt as a piece of smart bravado, he felt as a deep hurt. What made them feel defiant made him feel sorrowful; exhilaration in them, abysmal grief in him.

Now, our question is, How can this chasm of difference be—not bridged—but *filled up* so that no trace of it will remain? Obviously Neesima must do it; and he must begin by showing them how he feels. He may show them how he feels by what he says,¹¹ but more by what he does.¹² The first item to be exhibited (ἐνδειξις, Rom. 3:25) is one in which he and they agree, namely, that wrongdoing deserves to be punished. This age-long deliverance of the moral consciousness is not expunged by the present day aversion to the retributive aspects of punishment. “In every punishment as such there must be justice, and this constitutes what is essential to the notion.”¹³ If the ferule was used and accepted for the correction of minor offenses against the school regulations, it was because both Principal and pupils carried deep in their nature a sense of “some pri-

¹¹ Matt. 23:34: “I send to you prophets.”

¹² Matt. 21:37: “Last of all he sent his son.”

¹³ Kant, quoted by Mozley: *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, Scribners, 1916, p. 208, ch. vii, Towards a Doctrine, an excellent discussion. Mozley's bibliography contains more than 150 names.

mary and necessary connexion between sin and punishment," a sense that the infliction of the due penalties of wrongdoing must first be justified by itself as punishment, *i. e.*, as pure evil.¹⁴ Their assent to this connection is, I repeat, due to the identity of their moral constitution; it bears no particular relation to the specific difference that has arisen between them; and therefore it is not a step towards reconciliation, though it does furnish a platform on which such a step may be taken.

The next thing the Principal must show is that he suffers—he is indeed the chief sufferer—in the situation their wrongdoing has produced.¹⁵ This began to appear when he told them how he loved them, how deep a hurt their behavior had given him, how deeply grieved he was. And we may believe that already some temperaments in the group began to soften, to feel sorry for him. And when in further proof of his love he proceeded so completely to identify himself with them in the wrong they had done as to accept in himself the punishment due them and stood there, to speak in figures, openly crucified before them, dying their death—when they saw this, rebellion died in them. From being sorry for him, they turned with self-loathing upon themselves, and cried out: 'What have we done? We have shed innocent blood; we have "crucified" our friend.' And with a rush of apprehension they saw that it was their deed that had inflicted this hurt,¹⁶ brought this blight upon the school and upon their own natures, and they hated it. If now they could have done so—so completely had they passed over to his point of view and way of feeling

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

¹⁵ Cf. Douglass White: *Forgiveness and Suffering*.

¹⁶ Cf. E. D. Burton on Rom. 3:23-26, "The suffering of Christ on the Cross is the momentary laying bare of the agelong hurt sin inflicts on the heart of God."

about the whole matter—they would have healed his wounds, and taken upon themselves in tenfold volume the suffering he bore.¹⁷

We here see the third item in the terms of forgiveness. Once this state of feeling has been reached, there remains no barrier to the full outflow of love toward the culprits—culprits no longer, now that they have come to see and feel what wrongdoing is and what it does and to hate it as every sound moral nature does. And love's last demonstration is the word of forgiveness; for it means we are together again, with nothing, *nothing*, between.¹⁸

The story of the three children, though it appears to do so, does not pass over items 1 and 2 of the terms of forgiveness as here set forth. For both children and father recognized the relation of authority with its righteous law, 'Thou shalt not swing,' the obligation of obedience, with the desert of punishment for disobedience; and they also saw the suffering which was the entail of the disobedience. It was because they were deeply together in the experience of suffering, due to their love for the little sister—the suffering of the children shot through and through with twinges of self-reproach. 'How wicked we were to disobey Father, to make him suffer so, to bring this terrible affliction upon little sister'—it was because of this togetherness in the experience of suffering that no further infliction, no further exhibition of the wickedness of disobedience and of its inevitable consequence of suffering, was needed. The children were forgivable, for they felt as the father did about their sin, and he forgave them. He

¹⁷ *Of.* old hymn, "I hate the sins that made thee mourn," and little girl's "Dear Lord, I'm sorry for you."

¹⁸ Isa. 44: 22, "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions;" Isa. 43:25, "I will not remember thy sins."

could not blot out all the consequences, for the paralysis lingered on for months, but he could and did blot out the remembrance of their sin. This need not mean that memory lost the broken swing as an occurrence which it could no longer recall, but it does mean that, when recalled, it was no longer a barrier to, nor even a shadow on, their fellowship. On the contrary, it deepened fellowship, for it had proved how deeply *at one* in their essential nature father and children were.

IV

The reader will have observed that I have used the words offense, affront, injury, wrong, in describing the breaking of fellowship and that I have not been able to keep the word sin out. I have not been unmindful of the fact that the first group of words applies to persons and that sin is properly used only as between ourselves and God. I undertake in this last section of the paper to set down the points involved in the statement of Paul, "We are reconciled to God through the death of his Son" (Rom. 5: 10). We must sweep our minds clean of all such ideas as that God needed to be changed in His disposition toward sinners; or that He punished His Son on the Cross. God is Love from eternity, and God was in Christ taking the world back into His favor, as in John 3: 16 and 2 Corinthians 5: 19.

1. Says Amiel,¹⁹ "The best measure of the profundity of any religious doctrine is given by its conception of sin and the cure of sin." It is clear from what has been said above that we are here concerned with *God's estimate of sin*. Matthew Arnold²⁰ said the revelation of the Old Testament is, "Jehovah loveth Righteous-

¹⁹ Journal, Dec. 13, 1858.

²⁰ Literature and Dogma, a book not to be forgotten.

ness; the revelation of the New Testament is Righteousness by Jesus Christ." "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of thy throne" (Psa. 89: 14; 97: 2). "Yea, O Lord God, the Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments" (Rev. 16: 7). Such statements mean that the universe is moral to its center in the heart of God. They mean also that sin is antithetic to the universe as a whole, as disintegration is antithetic to integration, as disruption and taint are antithetic to perfection. If now we leave these abstract terms and come to personal, and remember that the God of our religion is not an impersonal absolute, but the infinitely compassionate Father of our spirits, we may begin timidly to feel how sin throbs along every fiber of His being as pain, and how every resource of infinite love and wisdom must come forth to put sin away. How does God feel about sin? We have no answer to that question but—Jesus! Before Jesus appeared all that our Father could say was, "The soul that sinneth it shall die" (Ezk. 18: 4, 20; Gen. 2: 17; etc.).²¹ This was a warning, and it affirms "a necessary connexion between sin and punishment" (Mozley, *ut supra*). Now, we were made in the image of God—the children are like the father—and the likeness appears in nothing more distinctly than in our instant and instinctive feeling that sin merits punishment. Our blessed Lord, who is the Father's compassion in supreme manifestation, and who must have corrected it if it were wrong, reaffirmed again and again this ancient judgment—sin deserves punishment and must be punished (Matt. 25: 46; Luke 16: 19 ff.).

²¹ It is surely time we had dropped the notion that physical death is the penalty of sin. Adam and Eve did not "die" the day they ate the fruit, and Christ's saints "die" along with all others. Cf. White: *Forgiveness and Suffering*, p. 25.

One may be permitted to ask, How else could the sanctity of law be maintained if there were no "penalty" for disobedience? Would not wholesale remission of penalty break down, at once and forever, the reign of law in a moral world? Professor Mozley, in the volume referred to,²² effectively answers those who find difficulty in punishment as vindication of law, and so as retributive. He says, "Rightly considered, punishment begins as the due reward of sin, that is, as retribution; penitence changes its character from retributive to restorative; but *penitence involves the acknowledgment of the righteousness of the retribution*" (p. 208), for penitence is assent to the righteous judgment of God upon sin. Thus far we have God's estimate of sin in the form of law "in its absolute eternal character of holiness," and in the instinctive assent of our moral nature to the iniquity of the violation of law. "Nothing can make amends for the violation except some act of a quality equal to the law's own essential quality." Thus the military leader, Schamyl, in our story, when the culprit was discovered, had the alternatives of ignoring the offense in order to shield his mother, or of affirming on a scale as public as the first promulgation of the law the certainty of punishment, and he chose the latter. It was love that made him do it, and here we see another phase of the revelation of God's estimate of Sin. The Old Testament is not without foregleams (Psa. 103: 13; Jer. 31: 3; etc.), but the full revelation of Love is given in the New; and not till the final disclosure in the Cross do we at last see what Origen meant when he said, "God is Love, and Love is Agony."

One fears that many people in our day have lost, or are in danger of losing, the austerity of love. A senti-

²² The Doctrine of the Atonement, Scribners, p. 206 ff.

mental age cannot endure the infliction of pain, and easily mistakes leniency, which is weakness, for love, which in its mighty reach may do terrible things to snatch its object from the jaws of death. "Behold the goodness and severity of God" (Rom. 11: 22). "His mercy indeed is infinite; but then it is the mercy of a holy God that embraces us, and not the unmoral compassions of a Being made in our own image."²³ Perhaps Moses, in Exodus, is the nearest Old Testament parallel, when in a horror of indignation and in an agony of love, he cried: "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin. . . . Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book." (Exod. 32: 31-32.) Only parents who love their children more than life have ever sounded this otherwise unplumbed mighty deep; who, writhing in anguish and drowned in tears, cry: 'O my child, better were it for me if you had never been born than that you should grow up all stained and sodden and rotten with sin. Better, if I had never seen the light of the sun than that a child of mine should go away into the awful night of the outer darkness.' Love like that, but a dim reflection of the love of God, is antipodal to pliancy, concession, flexibility, and can never relax an atom of the "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12: 14). Only love like that, nay, only God who is Love—and this is the special point for emphasis here—can feel the sting, the hatefulness, the unmitigable horror, the grief, the shame, the heartbreak, of sin, as the gloom of mountain abysses can be measured only by the whiteness of the snow on their inaccessible heights.

To revert to our general again, Schamyl alone in all that camp, and he only because of the depth of his

²³ Thom: *Op. cit.*, Series I, p. 75.

nature and of his religion and because of his keen sense of the complex solidarity in which the camp was bound—only Schamyl could feel the blight of the bribery and corruption which had infected his army. And he must, as far as could be, bring the whole army to share his feeling of the sacredness of law, of the inexcusable iniquity of violations, of the preciousness of sound morals, of the importance of securing the future against repetition of crime—all these and much else he must make them feel, and, in particular, he must make them see that *nothing is safe* in his and their world if the poison of sin remains. It is easy to see what would have been the effect if he had said, ‘Since it is my mother who is the culprit, the law cannot take its course.’ On the contrary, he said, ‘Since it is my mother who is the culprit, my mother whom I love better than life and whom I must therefore save, the law must take its course.’ With what result we saw. And when he took her place and before the awe-struck people took her punishment upon himself, he gave the supreme demonstration of his hatred of sin and of his love for his mother and for his people. Her worst punishment was to see the penalty her crime brought on her son, and she saw it with a penitence which made her whole. This incident, I think, helps us to see how Jesus is God’s estimate of sin written in characters of His own life’s crimson.

2. And what is our response to this revelation? All our stories show that the normal response is to wake up to the realization that God is not indifferent to sin or lenient to sinners, and that therefore the pleasures of sin are a snare, and, indeed, an illusion, and lead on to terrible consequences, to ourselves, to the moral universe, to God. “Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons

if men is fully set in them to do evil" (Eccl. 8: 11). The psalmist tells us he nearly lost his footing when he saw that men could be wicked and prosperous and die without pangs (Ps. 73). Where was the judgment of God upon sin, its condemnation, the vindication of the law against it? After all, is not sin a trivial thing about which men ("modern men") need not "bother themselves"?

The withering rebuke to all such thoughts is the central tragedy of history, the Cross of Christ, where God incarnate took upon Himself the doom of sin, and so condemned sin in the flesh, thus affirming before all worlds and forever the holiness of law and the inflexible integrity, the majesty, of the moral order centered in Himself. Plato had said that "one perfectly just could not appear amongst the wicked without provoking a murderous hatred." So it comes about that the revelation of the holy love of God in Jesus became the occasion of the development of sin to its extreme manifestation. From the side of the revelation of sin, He is the victim of murderous hatred; but from the side of the revelation of the sacredness of moral law, His voluntary submission to the just judgment of sin in death carries the exhibition of love to its utmost demonstration.

The sight of suffering is not of itself redemptive; it may indeed be hardening; but the sight of suffering willingly borne in place of those whose sin deserved it is redemptive, for it carries two elements, the acceptance of doom and love for the doomed trying to save them. The first looks toward God and says, "True and righteous are thy judgments" (Rev. 16: 7); the second looks in infinite pity toward sinners and says, "Be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5: 20). The normal response is repentance and confession, whereupon the word of for-

givenness is spoken and reconciliation is accomplished. Inflexibility and tenderness have both been conserved, while the end, restored fellowship, has been secured. Forgiveness, and forgiveness alone, meets both requirements. As Amiel put it, "Pardon alone conciliates the spotless purity of perfection with the infinite pity due to weakness—that is to say, it alone preserves and defends the idea of holiness while giving full scope to that of love."²⁴

In His Son God enters into union with the sinner on the plane of his sin, and so opens the way to a union of the sinner, by repentance and confession, with Himself on the plane of His holiness. In this union the past is blotted out and the future is assured. If a man refuses this last appeal there remains for him nothing but a settled isolation, the loneliness and bitterness of a heart that can never forget its refusal of the infinite Love.

²⁴ Journal, April 15, 1870.

SHANGHAI, CHINA.

BIBLICAL HOMILETICS

THE CENTRAL MESSAGE OF THE SERMON

By DR. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN

BEING sure that our text is in the Bible, we proceed to find out its actual meaning, and then to elaborate its message. Elaboration is not destruction. Nevertheless, in the process of elaboration it is always possible, very possible and very easy, to deviate at some point from the true line of thinking, and then to continue in the deflection until one finds oneself far from the thought of the text, and sometimes even contradicting its teaching.

Elaboration is far more than simple statement. The text has postulates, implicates, deductions, applications. They are important, though not patent in a simple statement. Elaboration consists in the discovery of these things and their setting forth in such form as to make the simple statement more luminous. The sermon is the text repeated more fully, in that these things—postulates, implicates, deductions, applications—are discovered and declared, or at least recognized. Elaboration is in order to clarity. It must proceed in a systematic way in order to a systematic statement.

Defining the Purpose

Every sermon, then, must have a scheme, a plan, at least in the mind of the preacher, and I think that this plan should be made clear to a congregation. A great many things called sermons are really essays. The etymology of the two words will help us. An essay means a weigh-

ing or a trial. The Century Dictionary gives this definition: "In literature a discursive composition concerned with a particular subject, usually shorter and less methodical than a treatise." That is an essay. A sermon, on the other hand, is a finished and complete discourse on a given subject. Therefore the preacher should define his purpose, ere he commences his elaboration. Granted a text, a general idea is suggested. A text grows on you, and you want to preach on it. Why? Because it says something. It says something to you. There is an idea, a general ideal, created in your mind by it, or you would not take the text. To communicate that idea is your purpose. That purpose should first be defined; secondly, kept in mind through all the process of preparation; and thirdly, stated at the outset in delivery.

It is quite possible that, in the course of preparation, you will have to change your purpose, or else your text. The text fastens itself upon you. There is something in it, something that appeals to you. There is a message in it of some sort. There is something in this paragraph, verse, sentence, phrase—a definite idea. There is your purpose, your message. You want to deliver that thing. Write it out briefly; then start to work on your text. Again and again you will find that the thing you thought was there is not there at all. You may get another sermon out of your text, or you may go to another text to find your sermon. First, then, you define your purpose.

Kinds of Sermons

Let us take a little aside at this point, as it will throw light on the whole subject of sermonizing. Sermons are different in reference to method—topical, textual or ex-

pository. They are also different in character. A sermon may be doctrinal, or it may be ethical, or it may be devotional, or it may be, to make a word cover a large ground, Providential.

It may be doctrinal, not directly ethical, not necessarily apologetic, not invariably polemical. There are some men who never seem able to preach a doctrinal sermon without getting into apologetics or polemics. They are always fighting for the thing they are preaching, which is, in my judgment, a questionable thing to do. But a doctrinal sermon is always didactic; it is always of teaching value. It is always in some sense philosophical. It is always practical. That ought to be recognized. It is possible to preach doctrinal sermons without saying anything of their bearing on life. But that is a great mistake. If you take any one of Paul's letters and divide it at some point into two parts, you will find a statement of doctrine, followed by the application of doctrine to duty. There are two sorts of preachers who seem to fail in this regard. There are those who pay no attention to the doctrines of our faith; they say that all that matters is the practical. There are those who have nothing but doctrine, and seem to have no recognition of its bearing on life. In Paul's letters neither of these mistakes is made. In them the doctrine is declared, and then it is applied. That must always be so, I think, in doctrinal preaching. The great doctrines of the faith ought to be preached. But the mere annunciation of a truth is of no value in a sermon, save as it is brought to bear upon life.

Then there is the ethical sermon, in which you will be dealing almost exclusively with the sanctions of conduct, personal, social, national. The Christian

preacher has, or ought to have, a national message, certainly the social one, and of course the personal.

Again there are sermons purely devotional in the sanest and best sense, dealing with the secrets of our life and with the maintenance of the laws of our fellowship with God. Sermons that aim, to use a phrase which is a little hackneyed, at the deepening of our own spiritual life. The importance of them cannot be overestimated.

There are also Providential sermons, that deal with the government of God, the providence of God in that sense.

I think the preacher must recognize at once what is the character of the sermon he is going to prepare. This might be decided in many ways. For instance, a great truth is recognized. It has to be proclaimed, explained, and applied. Or a message is to be delivered to meet a need. Sin demands a message from the preacher; sorrow calls for a message from the preacher; ignorance clamors always for a message from the preacher. The true sermon is always intended to meet a need. The sermon may be argumentative, having an argument on account of doubt. There are always some who are perplexed in faith. Your message may be directed to the helping of them and to the solution of their doubts. Or disobedience or some difficulty is calling for a message. These are merely illustrations of different kinds of sermons that we have to preach if we are in the regular pastorate.

Arranging the Plan

The text being found and the purpose defined, it is necessary that the message should be put in form. This means the gathering and classification of materials and the putting of them into such systematic relation that the truth may be presented to an audience. The ar-

arrangement must always be kept in mind. That brings us right up to the scheme or plan. Dr. Parkhurst said: "Plan intensifies. Assurance of a purpose makes our work solid and consecutive. Plan centers, energizes, as the burning-glass does sunbeams. Shiftlessness is only another name for aimlessness. Purpose directs energy, and purpose makes energy." I think that is a very helpful statement of the case. I believe that the preparation of the plan is of far more value than the writing of the sermon. The plan represents your thought, the composition represents your expression.

How are we to go about preparing our plan. There are diversities of method. No man can tell another how to make a sermon. Every man must find out by experience the best way of making sermons. Dr. Guthrie, that famous preacher, fastened on a text, and then he put on paper, just as they occurred to him, all thoughts, sentences, illustrations, that seemed pertinent to the subject in hand. Having provided a store of material in that way, he arranged it under appropriate heads, and proceeded to the proper work of composition. Archbishop Magee never looked about him for suggestions until he sketched the idea of his sermon. I think that is fine. Spurgeon fixed upon a text, and then, for many years, gave it to his secretary, who was a minister, in his great library, saying, "There's my text." Then that minister went through Spurgeon's library, which he had indexed for him, and brought everything that had any bearing on that text, and piled books all round him. He took those books and read all those things and then made his outline. That was his method. But you cannot make rules for all men.

For years I have made it a very careful and studied rule never to look at a commentary on a text until I

have spent hours on the text alone. Get down and sweat over the text by yourself. That is my method. Dr. Maclaren thought about the text, without pencil or paper, till he had something to say, and then he went and said it with as little thought of himself as possible. Beecher never knew until Saturday night what his text for Sunday was going to be. Then he shut himself up alone, and after an hour and a half of undisturbed study on Sunday morning the vision stood before him, and he hastily sketched an outline. Nevertheless, there are some fundamental matters.

In the preparation of the plan there are two processes. Let me describe them as fundamental and final. The first is spade work. The second is done with finer tools. The first prepares for and demands the second. The second demands and perfects the first.

What do I mean when I talk about fundamental or spade work? First of all, get ready to begin; prepare your mind and heart and will. Before you settle down to sermon making, know that your mind is clear and open. A man is in danger of becoming very technical here, suggesting rules, which are of very little use. Principles are the great things. From my own personal experience, the best hours are the morning hours. For many years I have observed this rule, that when I am at work, preparing either sermons or Bible work of any kind, I never allow myself to open a newspaper until after one o'clock in the day. I urge this upon you: Go to your Bible and study with a clear mind.

There is a very close relation between bodily condition and mental activity. I once heard Dr. W. J. Dawson say, "Half the bad theology in the world is due to suppressed perspiration." There is a great element of truth in it. I think if you are going, tomorrow morn-

ing, to get into your work of making a sermon, you will eat your supper with a view to tomorrow morning's sermon. See to it that there is nothing to clog the working of your mind. The mind should be clear and open, the heart undivided, and the will yielded and dependent. In other words, we need the constant readjustment of our personal life to the Lord in whose Name we are to speak. Part of that preparation may carry us a long way from preparation, but without it there is always lacking the very something that makes preaching preaching.

The Work on the Text

Then, these things being granted, there follows earnest thinking, real thinking. The text is the sermon, and to that you give yourself in serious thought. Isn't it so that that is one of the things most difficult to do, but the habit, once acquired, becomes one of the joys of life—real, personal, unbiased thinking? It is so easy, especially when you have built up your library, to look at the text and then turn around and put your hand on a book. It is a real peril. There must be first-hand thinking, actual work, critical work, on the text. As I said, I have made it a rule never to turn to any commentary or any exegetical work on a text until I have put in personal, first-hand work on that text alone. Then take any aid you can, and you will find that these aids will help you to correct mistakes you have made. But you have gained enormously if you have sat down yourself and toiled at your text. That means that, as you do it, you will note illustrations, the pictorial value of words, related stories in the Bible, references that you find. Only be very careful of reference Bibles. I am not referring to any particular Bible which is called a reference Bible. All that business of taking a text and look-

ing to see all the other texts indicated is often destructive of real thinking and real Biblical work.

If a man settles down to his work, and makes notes and attends to the words and their idiomatic meanings in the language in which this text is found, he will be mastering for himself the real meaning and the real intention of his text. Did you ever hear what Emile Zola said when some one asked him about his writing of a novel? Having compiled seventeen hundred pages of notes, he said: "Now my book is finished. I have only to write it." I have always liked that. It is the compiling of those pages of notes that constitutes the real preparation for the preaching of a sermon.

I would rather have on my study shelf one book of scholarly exegesis than forty volumes of devotional exposition. Exposition in the sense of devotional application is very, very beautiful, but from the standpoint of sermon making I would rather have Westcott on John than all the devotional books on that Gospel that I have ever seen.

Constructive Work

Then comes the final, or constructive, work. So far, from the viewpoint of the sermon, everything is chaos. Our business is to produce cosmos, to bring all that mass of material into form. Find your material for your own sake. Perceive it, then reduce it to order and bring out your scheme as clearly as you can. Fashion your material for the sake of presenting it to your people. Prepare for presentation. This is work on the highest level, demanding all the powers of the man. Perception, memory, suggestion, imagination, are all active agencies, by which facts and truths are brought into mental control, while comparison and reason are the means of adapting them to the use of the speaker.

My subject is not psychology, but it is good sometimes just to think of the special faculties that may be employed in this work of preparing a sermon. Break them up in this way. The presentative faculty, the conservative faculty, the reproductive faculty, the representative faculty, the elaborative faculty, the regulative faculty. (I am quoting.) By the presentative is meant the faculty of perception, which needs concentration. By the conservative is meant memory, the holding of the thing. By reproductive is meant the faculty of suggestion and re-assembling. By representative is meant the faculty of the imagination. By elaborative is meant the faculty of comparison and of relation between parts. By regulative is meant the faculty of reason and common sense brought to bear upon the whole of your material. You can take more modern terms, but the whole of one's mentality should be concentrated upon this work.

I want to say something about the use of the imagination. That is, in my judgment, the supreme work of preparation. That does seem a most dangerous thing to say—for imagination can play all sorts of tricks with you—unless I add that the activity of imagination must be guarded by the operation of all other things. Perception is the grasp of the actual, memory preserves it, suggestion reproduces it, comparison weighs it, reason balances it, imagination sets it all on fire. That is the place for imagination, but if you begin with imagination without the use of the other faculties you are always in danger.

May I suggest that you take Ruskin, volume II of *Modern Painters*, and see what he says on the imaginative faculty. I think you will find it very useful. He speaks of imagination as acting in three ways: Imagina-

tion penetrative, imagination associative, imagination contemplative. Put these three down and look at them, and use imagination in these three ways, and you will have the whole ground covered. Don't take any one truth, however great, and make that the only thing you see in your preaching. There is no end of that being done today. You always know what some men will preach about next time. They see just one truth—and it is a truth. But if you don't balance the particular truth with other truths, your very truth may become, before you know it, a dangerous heresy. Ruskin also carefully distinguishes between the activity of the imaginative faculty in fancy, and imagination. He says: "Fancy plays like a squirrel in its circular prison, and is happy. Imagination is a pilgrim on the earth, and her home is in Heaven. Shut her from the fields of the celestial mountains, bar her from breathing their lofty, sun-warmed air; and we may as well turn upon her the last bolt of the tower of famine, and give the keys to the keeping of the wildest surge that washes Capraja and Gorgona."

Divisions

What are the essentials of a plan? In an earlier paper I said the essentials of the sermon are truth, clarity, and passion. Our thought here has to do with clarity. In order to that we need three things: An introduction, the message itself put into proper form, and then a conclusion. Aristotle in the laws of writing gives the introduction, proposition, proof, conclusion. In the making of the sermon you don't begin with your introduction or the conclusion. These are the last things. First, the great central message, thought out, systematized, stated. Then you are ready for introduction and conclusion.

First of all, we have to remember that there are very

few texts which are not capable of more than one sermon. Almost any text will suggest more than one message. I found twelve sermons by Henry Ward Beecher on one text, delivered over a period of ten years. They were all different; he did not repeat himself at all. He had preached twelve times on that one text. That simply illustrates what I say; there are very many treatments possible, though the text is the same in every case. Therefore it is always necessary to decide on the particular theme that you are going to consider, when you have found your text.

For example, let us take that great text—on which I never dared to attempt a sermon, about which I have talked, and round which I have talked, and to which I have returned—John 3:16. Think for a moment of the variety of tremendous themes that you may find in that great text. God's love for the world; there is a theme in itself, and that text would be a great one for it. Or you may take God's gift, His only begotten Son. You say they are together, but you have two messages there, two entirely different messages. You can find in that text a sermon on the peril of man, suggested by one word, "that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*." You can find in that text the great truth, that life is provided only in the Son—"that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have age-abiding life." Life in the Son—a great theme in itself for a message. You can find in that text the condition upon which we may find life—faith in the Son. These are all themes. You may say: 'But these are all parts of the one theme. You ought to take them all in when you preach from the text.' Try it. There are so many things in it. I have taken it as the supreme illustration

of what I mean. Is the whole text to be taken, or one of these parts?

Again, as a general principle, in the message the theme is discussed. In your preaching the work is that of analysis, that is, division, breaking up; then synthesis, that is, the recognition of the unity in your divisions. Here is a danger which often faces us, that we get divisions that look clear-cut and sharp, but when we look at them again they do not synthesize. That shows that we have gone wrong somewhere. One must watch that no one division runs away with the others. If this occurs there is some break in your thinking. It was the fashion in England, in theological colleges as we call them, seminaries as you call them, to tell men that the old method of division was out of date, and that your message should flow smoothly on without any marked division. I feel that that is an entirely false idea. You have a thought in preaching; you want to get your thought over to your people. It is of tremendous importance that you do it clearly, with sequence and relationship. In order to do that, nothing can be more important than division. First of all, to give a clear conception to the preacher himself, so that he knows where he is going. And also it is important to the hearer, that the hearer may catch hold of these divisions, clearly marked. Then, when presently at home that hearer goes over the ground, if the divisions are with him he will remember a great many things that you said which he would not remember without the divisions.

A little while ago a friend and I heard a sermon. When we got home I said to my friend, "That was a marvelous utterance." He said, "Yes, it really was, but what was it about?" Sometimes you can't discover the train of thought in a sermon. It may be you will

decide it is not worth while. But there is a way of letting the clear thought grip the people so that they will have your message. I have found this to be of enormous value.

Phillips Brooks said, "The true way to get rid of the boniness of a sermon is not by leaving out the skeleton, but by clothing it with flesh." I think you have everything there. You should not try to build up the body of the sermon without the skeleton. It is a great advantage when you can see the skeleton—though you must not make that figure go on all fours. Let the people see the bones, the ribs, the great things that form the framework. I am far more concerned about that than about the verbiage. The clothing is important, but secondary.

The character of the divisions. Of course that depends a great deal upon the text. When a text makes one or two statements clearly, you have your divisions without any difficulty. Sometimes you may make them by declaring the things you are proposing to do with that particular text. Sometimes the divisions are determined by the deductions you propose to make, stating them ahead very clearly and then working from your text toward them. Sometimes by the applications that you are proposing to make.

Take one or two illustrations. Very reverently again let us take John 3:16. Here are some things that suggest themselves to you, quite simple statements, and not constituting divisions except as we are seeking to deal with them. First, God loved the world. There is a statement which is the statement of the text, but it is not merely that He loves; He has demonstrated His love. Again, God has demonstrated His love with the purpose of calling forth confidence in that love—"whosoever

believeth." And ultimately, of course, He has done this in order to the salvation of those whom He loves, which salvation can only come through their confidence in Him.

Take Jeremiah 31: 29-30: "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge." Also Ezekiel 18: 2-4: "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

There is a text there—"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." It is a great text. But if you are going to preach from that text you need at least those verses. Here is an illustration of the vital relation between the text and the context. How are you going to break up that text? How are you going to state what you are going to do? Let us first consider the history of that proverb. Then let us examine God's answer to that proverb. Then let us state the resultant truths. You have a scheme at once in front of yourself and your congregation. Once you take that method, several things are in your mind. You have your text, but you must look at the context. When you have done so there are three divisions. Tell your people the history of the proverb, God's answer to it, then you can go on making your deductions. When you do that you will never preach from that particular text as though it was a truth. You will start by telling

your congregation that it is a lie; it is a proverb that they coined in those days. Yet that is a great text. Preaching from it when I have a crowd of students before me, I tell them that, if their teeth are on edge, they have been gnawing after the sour grapes. A fine text, but I have only referred to it because of a suggested method of treatment.

Here is another. "God is love." It is infinite, so you can break it up in a hundred ways. I remember preaching from it, or trying to. I only had two divisions: "God is love." Therefore His government is perfect. Therefore human wisdom is that of obedience to His government. That is all. It is inadequate, and yet is it? See what it does for you. Behind these two tremendous thoughts you have that greater thought, that God is love. You have a scheme, a message.

I came across an old Puritan sermon which has something in it of the sensational. We think now that they had nothing sensational in those days, but some of them were very sensational, and yet they were very true to the text. John Burgess announced that he would preach on "Beelzebub Driving and Drowning His Hogs." You know where he went for his text. This is the way he introduced it: "'And they besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered into the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, in number about two thousand; and they were drowned in the sea.'" In these words the devil verified three old English proverbs, which, as they contain the general drift of my text, shall contain the substance of this ensuing discourse and constitute our divisions. They are: 'The devil will play at small game rather than none.' Second, 'They run fast when the devil drives.' Thirdly, 'The devil brings his hogs to a

fine market.' ” These were real proverbs current at the time. He proceeded: “ ‘The devil will play at small game rather than none at all.’ ‘All the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine.’ ‘They run fast when the devil drives.’ When the unclean spirits entered into the swine, they ran violently. ‘The devil brings his hogs to a fine market.’ Into the sea.” That was peculiar, but at any rate it was clear, and I will undertake to say no congregation ever forgot it. They got his divisions.

Let me give you a slightly different one, by another old Puritan. He preached on this text: “So Mephibosheth dwelt in Jerusalem: for he did eat continually at the king’s table; and was lame on both his feet.” It is a beautiful story about David and his love for Jonathan. He made his divisions in this way: “My brethren, we see here tonight, first, the doctrine of human depravity—Mephibosheth was lame. Second, the doctrine of total depravity—he was lame on both his feet. Thirdly, the doctrine of justification—he dwelt in Jerusalem. Fourthly, the doctrine of adoption—he sat at the king’s table. Fifthly, the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints—he did eat at the king’s table continually.” Now, you may read all that into the text; you can make the text the illustration of your doctrine; but it is not really there.

I once heard a man preach on the Good Samaritan. Here were his truths. First of all, he said, the Good Samaritan is a type of Jesus; the wounded man is the type of the sinner; the pouring in of the oil and wine is the type of the Saviour’s work; the inn is the type of the church; he gave him two shillings, which means, “Having food and raiment, be therewith content.” That kind of sermon makes me nearly fall from grace.

We must be careful. Take for example the text: "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone." Now this is almost invariably misinterpreted in sermon literature, as far as I have read it. It is used as a very solemn warning—there comes a moment when a man may be so wedded to his idols that he is abandoned by God. But you cannot study your prophecy of Hosea without having that idea smashed to fragments. May a man be so wedded to his idols that God says, "Let him alone"? I don't think so. Hosea was a prophet of the Northern Kingdom principally, but he has Judah in mind all the time. At certain points it is as though he sent his voice ringing down from Israel, to whom he was preaching, to Judah. And that is a message to Judah, not the word of the Lord about Israel. The prophet says to Judah, concerning the Northern Kingdom of Israel, "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone." Make no league with Israel. Hosea is warning Judah against complicity with Israel. It is still a great text. But it doesn't mean the other thing at all. To see how far it is from meaning that God abandoned Ephraim, just take another text out of the same prophecy of Hosea. God is speaking: "O Ephraim, how shall I give thee up?" By the time you are at the end of the prophecy you see in the prophet's vision Ephraim restored. Ephraim in the earlier movements is represented by the prophet as bringing forth fruit, his own fruit. At the end it is said of Ephraim, "From me is thy fruit found." I mean the whole prophecy denies the right of any man to take that method of treating the text.

Dr. Peter T. Forsyth, when he was in this country some years ago, told me a little incident that greatly amused him. While here he was staying at a certain seminary, and the professor of homiletics greatly im-

pressed Dr. Forsyth because of a habit he had. On Monday morning he took the homiletics class, and each student gave a resumé of what he had done the previous day. Dr. Forsyth said that the professor said to one student:

"You were preaching last night?"

"Yes, sir, I was preaching."

"What text did you take?"

"I took that text, 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?' "

"A great text. Tell us how you treated it."

"I didn't try to treat it. I took the two obvious points."

"What are they?"

"First, the greatness of our salvation."

"Very good. What was the second?"

"A little advice on how to escape if we neglect it."

Dr. Forsyth said, "I think there is a great deal of preaching along that line just now." I also am afraid there is.

Let us take some more particular statements of principles. Decide on your principle of division by having very clearly before your own mind the purpose and the theme. You must have your theme and your purpose, and, with them in your mind, do your best to declare the truth so that it may be clearly understood. If that is your purpose, your divisions will come out of that purpose. Do you want to show the bearing of a truth on life generally, some phase of life, some immediate need? Your divisions will take color from your intention and your purpose. Is your sermon to be one in which you desire those listening to you to have an apprehension of a great truth, or do you want them to see how it affects

life? Your divisions will largely depend upon your purpose.

Let your main divisions be as few as possible. In the process of analysis many subdivisions will be found, but when you get down to prepare your scheme, you will find that they can generally be grouped under two or three heads. There is the fetish of the three; don't be bound by it. Let the divisions be few; let them influence your whole scheme. Never introduce new material into your conclusion. There is a temptation to do it. You have gone through your scheme, you have stated your truths, and you are likely to say something you have not said before. It is a great mistake. If there is something else not pertinent to your immediate theme in your text, note that fact and preserve it, for you may use the same text in that way at another time.

Let your divisions be clearly stated. There again is the point where there may be others who would give you other advice. But I think that it is very important so to state them. Clearly stated, because your hearers then get hold of your scheme, and they follow you more intelligently. They see where you are going.

Here is an illustration of how not to do it. The divisions are very fine. The text is, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." You see and feel the vastness of that great text. But note this scheme of divisions made by a preacher who said as he started: "The text naturally divides itself into three parts. First, we have presented to us the transcendental properties of the divine nature. Secondly, we have the anthropomorphic relations under which those transcendental properties of the divine nature stand revealed and become apprehensible. Thirdly, we have the Scripture symbolism by which

these relations and mysteries of the transcendental properties of the divine nature are apprehended, which constitutes worship." That is like a bad edition of *The House That Jack Built*. The divisions are excellent. He had right ideas. But he immediately put his ideas before the congregation in such language as I venture to say not one in a hundred would grasp.

Here is a far better example. "Thy word have I hid in my heart that I sin not against thee." First, the best treasure, "Thy word." Second, in the best place, "Hid in my heart." Third, for the best purpose, "That I sin not against thee." You see the contrast between these two things. That is what I mean by clarity of statement.

As to the time to state the divisions, personally I think at first. I think it is good to tell your congregation just what you are after and where you are going. State these things as far as possible so as to reveal unity. John Angel James, that great preacher of Birmingham, long ago said, "The divisions should be used for conjunction rather than disjunction."

GREEK RELIGION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

By E. G. SIHLER, Professor Emeritus, New York University

It is impossible in a brief essay to give more than a survey or to point out some characteristic features of what by an academic convenience we unify in the singular number. We might have headed this study, Forms of Worship in the Grecian World. Speaking, if I may, from my position now as a veteran classicist, I but gradually weaned myself from the conventional idealization of everything covered by that ethnical term. To rank the adulterous and pan-erotic husband and brother of Hera, the ravisher and lover of Ganymede, with Jehovah is a feat confidently undertaken by a certain school. But apart from Homer and Hesiod, the loftiest flights of Pindar or Aeschylus¹ are but tallow dips compared, say, with the single psalm 139. When Paul used the phrase, "folly to the Gentiles" (1 Cor. 1:23), *i.e.* to the Greeks, he spoke from his own life and environment, a world which encompassed him about everywhere he went, unless in Jerusalem or Jewish Palestine.

It is true that we find in some of the Greek philosophers what I may call a conceptual God; but in life and living, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, as well as Zeno of Cyprus and his school adapted themselves to their civic environment. The Stoics particularly, while dissolving the god-figures of Homeric traditional "religion" by

¹ As to the personal morality of some of the culture-heroes of the Hellenic world, see Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* XIII, 601-604, gangrene of Greeks with which I do not wish to stain this page, no bitter or polemical insinuation of a patristic writer.

means of physical allegory, never felt called upon to impugn or reform any established worship in towns, lands, valleys or given countryside.

A conceptual deity? Let me cite a few noble passages from Aristotle, who often refers to "gods and *daimones*," but also, in a quasi-personal way, particularly in his *Metaphysics*, seems to strive for more basic conceptions. There, *e. g.* (p. 1064, a. 37) he defines the Deity, as "the first and sovereign principle," distinct from and superior to all things of nature. Elsewhere (p. 1072, a. 26), "and we say that God is a living being eternal and perfect, so that life and continuous and eternal time [existence] is a property of God; for this *is* God." And again (*De Caelo* I, 9, p. 279, a. 25), "The aim of the entire Heaven and that which comprises all time and infinity is *Aion*, which has gotten its designation from eternal existence,² for it is immortal and divine." And further (*ibid.*, line 32), "neither has it anything evil, nor does it stand in need of its own perfections;" further (p. 286, a. 9), "everything has its purpose-principle in its function [worth], but the function of God is immortality, that is, immortal life; hence it is necessary that the Deity should possess creative-power [*kinesis*] from eternity." "God is either intelligence or something beyond intelligence" (1483, a. 27). "God and nature do nothing in vain" (p. 271, b. 29). The great analyst discriminates or sets apart also the actual worship in the popular religions. "The rest has actually been brought forward [*προσῆκται*] for the persuasion of the multitude in the direction of the laws and advantage" (*Metaphysics* XI, 8, p. 1074, b. 3).

His famous pupil Alexander the Great earnestly sought to pass for a son of Zeus Ammon, and Aristotle

² ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰὲς εἶναι.

in his will provided that his son-in-law Nikanor was to dedicate an "*anathema*" (religious donation) which the philosopher had once vowed when Nikanor was in peril, marble figures of four cubits each to "Zeus the Saviour and Athena the Saviour" (Diog. Laert. V, 13).

Of the many treatises on Greek religion which I know, by far the best seems to me to be that by G. A. Schoemann in the second volume of his *Griechische Altertümer* (Berlin, 3d ed., 1873, pp. 126-600), searching, exhaustive, sober, objective, fair. Schoemann is free, too, from the archeological mandatory ecstasy. He urges (p. 183) that it is wide of the mark to call Greek religion a religion of art; rather was it the deification of nature, and "consequently comprised gods to which no ethical standard whatever could be applied." He doubts whether the contemplation of perfectly sculptured lines actually reacted on conduct or conscience. The overwhelming mass of the people were interested in specific or regional worship, in profit and loss, in the success of actual living. And we may add here, as the later Pausanias exemplifies over and over again, that the more primitive cult-figures (*agalmata*), the *xoana* of ebony or cedar, wherever preserved, were preferred by actual worshipers to the most exquisite later works of Pheidias, Polykleitos, Lysippus or Praxiteles. And the acme of vanity is reached when some modern positivists (like Comte) tell us (holding absolutely aloof from Christianity themselves) that Christianity was a process of evolution, simply synchronizing with Seneca³ and the later Epictetus. Now Christianity was in both ethics and religion proper no evolution at all, but "the greatest revolution the history of mankind has known."⁴ Over-

³ See on these E. G. Sihler: From Augustus to Augustine, 1923, Stoicism and Christianity, p. 32 sqq.

⁴ Fr. Paulsen: *System der Ethik*.

beck the archeologist (whom I listened to in Leipzig some fifty years ago) interpreted "divine loftiness" into the portrait statue of the enormously prosperous courtesan Phryne. At Delphi (the Greek Westminster or St. Paul's) her statue, made by her lover Praxiteles, stood near that of King Philip of Macedon. There were no Mary Magdalenes at Athens or Antioch. Phryne had dedicated this *anathema* herself.⁵

But let us come down to our proper point of survey, the era of Augustus, when Joseph and Mary came down from Galilee to Bethlehem. We shall, I believe, be greatly favored in the survey proposed. Why? We shall be, largely, content to present data preserved for us, interwoven in his general work, by a close contemporary, nay protégée, of Augustus himself. I mean Strabo of Amaseia.⁶ He lived from about 63 B. C. to 19 A. D. or a little beyond, that is from the consulate of Cicero, and from the conquest of Jerusalem by Cicero's friend Pompey, into the reign of Tiberius who sent Pontius Pilate to Judea as his procurator for Judea in 26 A. D.

I begin with a swift conspectus of religious acts and matters as given by the lexicographer Pollux,⁷ an impressive summary which compels the thinking reader to realize that the singular word, religion, is a mere academic convenience when speaking of the Greek world, because each community had some preferred form. Gods then are said to be "above the heavens, in the heavens, on the earth, in the sea, under ground, holding the hearth, holding the city, ancestral, of the clan or kin, of the market, of the harvest, of the camp, propi-

⁵ Pausanias X, 15, 1.

⁶ Cf. Strabo of Amaseia, by E. G. Sihler, American Journal of Philology, 1923.

⁷ *Onomasticon* I, 23, 25.

tious, who turn away evil, who free from trouble, who cleanse and purify, who put to flight, saviours, who bestow security, who attend birth, who attend espousal and wedlock, who protect the grape." And in worship men "wash themselves, purify themselves, they come forward in new garments, pray to the gods, raise their hands on high, call down the gods, call up the gods, ask boons of the gods, sacrifice, sing paeans, sing hymns, give initial portions, burn incense, libate, hang up garlands, myrtle branches, offer up cakes." Joyous "screaming" (*ololygmos*) is permitted to women only. The victims must be "sound, straight-limbed, not mutilated, twisted or disfigured."

Now from Strabo (Casaubon, p. 179). On the very steep acropolis of Massilia, where now is the Mary church, Notre Dame de la Garde, which I visited in 1912, there is the sanctuary of the Ephesian Artemis, a daughter-sanctuary (*aphidryma*, literally a "delegated foundation," closely patterned as to cult-figure, ritual, and service after the famous one of Ionia). A lady of the emigrant Phocaeans who had a dream about this was appointed first priestess. Massilia in Strabo's time was such a focus of Greek culture that many Romans went thither to study instead of to Athens. It was claimed, in turn, that the cult-figure of the Aventine Diana was a delegated foundation from, or patterned after, the Massiliote one. Heracles gave his name to many cities or colonies; Strabo enumerates some ten in all, inclusive of Heraclea ad Sirim in Magna Graecia (p. 264). These Heraclotes claimed to be the possessors of the cult-figure of the Trojan Athena, the *Palladium*, and that this even then sometimes winked with or closed its eyes to worshipers. (Lourdes.) The Stoic Strabo adds, however, that Rome, Lavinium, Luceria, Siris

claimed the *Palladium*. Which then was the genuine Trojan one?

In western Sicily, on Mt. Eryx, there was a sanctuary of Aphrodite (a delegated foundation originally we may conclude from the Dea Syria of Tyre, as was that one also at Carthage, before its destruction in 146 B.C. Strabo 272) "greatly honored" once, and then full of female slaves, *hierodules*, property of the sanctuary, originally due to a "sacred endowment" by worshipers of the lust-goddess, both Sicilians and men from abroad, "but now, take the colony itself; it has thinned out, as have the great numbers of the sanctuary-owned slave girls. A delegated foundation," Strabo continues, "is the temple of Venus Erycina in Rome, before the Colline Gate."

At Sipontum, near Cape Garganus, is a *heroon* of Kalchas the soothsayer of the Iliad (p. 284). Those who seek oracles at this shrine sacrifice to him a black ram and then sleep on the fleece (incubation). In central Greece, Strabo intimates, particular worship had greatly fallen off through the thinning of population and wealth. We now note Olympia, the most famous spot of Hellenic *agones*, or athletic competition (p. 353 f.), in Elis on the Alpheios. The original fane had also an oracle of Zeus, "but although this has given out, the fame of the sanctuary has endured" on account of the games⁸ and the all-gatherings periodically succeeding each other. Here the gigantic cult-figure by Pheidias, son of Charmides of Athens was in a sitting posture, otherwise the roof would have had to be removed. The temple treasures were so vast that many states, as at Delphi, had erected treasure houses for

⁸ Cf. especially Eusebius' *Chronicon* and the elaborate recent volume of Professor W. W. Hyde, published by the Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1921. Cf. also Pausanias B. VI.

their own gifts. The imperceptible climax, in which mortal men were deified, or divinely glorified, and raised to the level of their own gods, such as they were, this fundamental thesis and herald's call of the Greek *ingenium*, could nowhere in the Mediterranean world be studied or felt more impressively or directly than on the Alpheios and in the grove Altis.

We may as well set down the fact that in central Greece at the beginning of the Christian Era many civic centers had become mere memories, because population and the means of subsistence had been reduced. Thus even in the generation immediately preceding the Augustan Age a close friend of Cicero, the great jurist Servius Sulpicius, had written to him, in 45 B.C., during Caesar's regency: "Returning from the province of Asia, when I was sailing away from Aegina towards Megara, I began to look out upon the regions roundabout. Behind me was Aegina, before me Megara, on my right the Piraeus, on the left Corinth [Caesar had just ordered its rebuilding after the destruction by Mummius a century before, 146 B.C.], towns which at one time were supremely prosperous; now they lie before one's eyes prostrate and ruined" (Cicero: *Ad Familiares* IV, 5). So too in the Spartan district population had severely run down "compared with the ancient abundance of men" (Strabo, p. 362). The local exponents or "exegetes" everywhere of course still rehearsed the myths which explained cult-figures, ritual, and the periodical practice of worship. Hecatombs indeed must have become rare, if ever witnessed. At Hermione in Argolis (p. 373) there was held to be a most direct descent to Hades, "hence they do not place the ferry-money [*naulon*, for Charon] in the [mouth of the] dead."

We notice also that certain cult-places and certain cult-figures were more resorted to than others; there was cherished the belief that the god made this a favorite spot beyond others, where he was also worshiped, a crudity of notion and tradition but little touched by time or the skepticism of the cultured, corresponding to the Roman conception of the *numen* of a given god. Thus in the case of the Poseidon-sanctuary at Kalauria, off the coast of Argolis, the "*asylia*" was long maintained (p. 374).

Epidaurus was still famous "on account of the epiphany of Asklepios the Healer," who "was believed [says the Stoic Strabo] to cure all kinds of diseases," whose sanctuary was always full of those who were ill, and "full of dedicatory tablets on which the cures were written up just as at Kos and Triikka" (p. 374). While Pausanias the Periegete flourished about 150 A.D., it is clear that his description would be completely applicable to the Augustan Age (II 27, 1 *sqq.*). The healing god's colossal sitting figure, of ivory and gold, had one hand laid on his serving-serpent. The inscriptions by grateful patients, Pausanias adds, were in the Doric dialect; hence we readily infer that they were formulated or edited by the priest-physicians. Childbirth, however, and dying were not permitted within the sacred precincts, just as on the isle of Delos.

At Corinth the fane of Aphrodite was (once) so rich (Strabo, p. 378) that it possessed some 1000 "sacred" or "consecrated" handmaids of the lust-goddess (p. 378) whose income, nay wealth, came largely from the sailors and commercial folk visiting the isthmian emporium, most of the money going to the priests. One of the girls boasted to another that she had in a short time "furled three sails," *i. e.*, ruined three skippers (p. 378). Cae-

ar, as noted before, had restored Corinth; Caesar whom Strabo always quotes as "*divus* Caesar," "Caesar the god," where the Stoic yielded to the worldly-wise courtier.

Orneai, now desolate, formerly had a sanctuary of Priapus, one of the minor "deities" enshrined in the Museum at Pompeii.

At the All-Ionian celebration (p. 384) when the steer in being slain bellows, it is a sign that Poseidon is propitious. A serpent driven from Salamis was accepted by Demeter at Eleusis as an attendant (p. 393).

Athens: As for the treasures or donations bestowed upon the goddess who shared her very name with the city, Strabo despairs of even touching the vastness of this subject. He contents himself with a few notes. In the fane of Athena Polias is the never-extinguished *kychnos*, or portable candelabrum (p. 396), and in the Parthenon, or temple of the virgin-goddess, the ivory cult-figure by Pheidias. Polemon the Periegete (or ancient Baedeker, *cir.* 177 B.C.) wrote four books about the donatives or *anathemata* on the Acropolis. Strabo rather briefly refers to the myths, clustering like ivy about the ruins of the past, connected with the *demes* of Attica,⁹ and still a living tradition in his day. We select but one item of traditional Attic deme-religion. At Phyle, on the way north, it was customary not to send any sacrifice to Delphi until they saw a stroke of lightning (Zeus-utterance) appearing as in a line with a spot or hill called the "chariot" (*harma*, p. 404).

Thespieae was then still visited, mainly, to see the famous Eros by Praxiteles, an *anathema* of the courtesan Glykera; the great sculptor had presented it to her

⁹ As for the mysteries of Eleusis, the great work by Lobeck, *Aglaophamus sive de Theologiae mysticae Graecorum sacris*, Koenigsberg, 1829, 2 vols., is still unexcelled and has never been equalled, I dare say.

(p. 410). At Lebadeia is the oracle of Trophonios, "The oracle-seeker descends himself, personally" (p. 414). (This curious detail is given by the later and most conservatively pious Pausanias, who went through all the rigid rites personally, IX, 39 *sqq.* The *mantis* told the visitor from the entrail-inspection of various sacrifices whether the deities involved would be propitious or not.)

Delphi, says Strabo (p. 419 *sqq.*), has now quite decidedly fallen into neglect; whereas in the past it was distinguished among all mantic places by the great number of historically attested responses of the Pythian priestess, whose ecstatic articulations were transformed into Greek hexameters by the regular attendant experts of that internationally-posted corporation. As for Delphi's ancient or former reputation, the Stoic scholar Strabo adds that it "seemed of them all to be the least given to lying." The Phocians looted the sacred treasure in 355-345 B.C., some 10,000 talents in all (Strabo 420). The great Apollo-sanctuary at Branchidae near Miletus was considered a delegated foundation from the Delphian (p. 421). At Karystos, Euboea, where great marble quarries are, there was then a fane of Apollo "Marmorius" (p. 446). I can merely state one essential point in this survey: Each valley, town, region or unified countryside maintained certain ancestral rites; the local limitation both of life and outlook in a given community was a conserving force; the pantomimic reproduction, the so called *orgia*, handed down from generation to generation, was much stronger than all the analysis or aloofness of the philosophical schools, especially the Stoic, who volatilized everything into physical processes and forces without abandoning the traditional nomenclature of the gods.

I will here set down some observations of Strabo himself. I premise that the Greeks meant by *theologos* and *theologia* something entirely different from what we connote by theologian and theology; they meant those who devised or fixed current myth and legend, authors or authorities such as Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus, Musaeus. I then beg to quote directly from Strabo,¹⁰ where we receive more than a glimpse of his philosophy of religion, or better, of worship. (p. 467). Both Greeks and non-Greeks, he says, "perform their 'sacred doings' or ritual acts [*hieropoias*] with a certain abandon or relaxation bound up with a festival, some with god-inspiration [*enthusiasmos*], some without, and some for the initiated only, and some publicly; nature suggests it so. . . . The concealment of initiation in worship renders the deity more august, imitating its nature which flees from our sense-perception." After some remarks about music as connected with worship he proceeds (p. 468): "Most of the Greeks then did assign to Apollo and Hecate and the Muses and Demeter, by Zeus! all the orgiastic [pantomimic] element and the Bacchic element and the element of dancing, and the mystery-element [connected with the initiations]; they also call Dionysos 'Iakchos' [the god of shouting] and [call him] also the leading power of the mysteries, viz., the *daimon* [supernal power, *numen*] of Demeter." As for the elemental myths, or god-legends, on which the recurrent pantomimic rites were based, our Stoic analyst trusted them no more than Seneca or St. Paul of the subsequent generation. As for the *Magna Mater* of

¹⁰ Strabo's attitude towards the myths of tradition is cool and critical. Cf. pp. 405, 409, 419, 421, 423, 429, 468, 487, 578, 618, 665, 687, 723, 750, 775, 803, 808. His references to "what is shown" by the local experts, cf. 191, 414, 420, 421, 587, 589, 676 fin., 806, 816. The historian, Ephorus (340 B.C.) rejected in his day the grossness of the physical conception of the myths, in some respects a precursor of Euhemerus.

Phrygia (p. 469) or of Trojan Ida, she was then especially worshiped by the Berekynthian Phrygians, the goddess also called Idaea and Dindymene, of Sipylos, of Pessinus, also called Kybele, while her special servants are called *kuretes* or *korybantes*. "Takchos," Strabo takes it, is merely a personification of the timbrels and shouting¹¹ of the worshippers. Strabo also calls attention to the fact that there were four mountains or mountain ranges (p. 470) called Olympos, which fact in itself caused a trend toward fusion of worship. The Orphic rites, he urges, generally came from Thrace and the North, as did music, for the Phrygians, too, came from Thrace across the Hellespont. The Athenians (p. 471), he goes on, are still fond of importations from abroad, "especially as to the gods,"¹² as, *e.g.*, those of Thrace and Phrygia, from Plato's and Demosthenes' time on.

Finally our Stoic scholar comes out in a quasi-personal way. The ancients, he says, adumbrated, or enveloped in riddlesome stories, their notions of nature and always added to their account the myth. To solve or dissolve with precision all these "riddles" (*ainigmata*) is not easy; some harmonize, others contradict one another; there is always a field for conjecture, *e.g.*, the habit of ascending mountains and the cult-habits and ideas thus engendered, or, that the gods are connected with the starry vault above us, and that it is they who practice providence and permit manticism and divination and the professional traveling mendicants supported by these beliefs. We now return to our survey. As for Crete, most of her social and legal institutions, so much idealized, as by Plato, in his framework of his

¹¹ So Strabo, p. 470, cites the Palamedes of Euripides.

¹² A notable confirmation of St. Paul's remark about Athens, Acts 17:23.

Leges, had to "yield to Roman ordinances, as also is the case of the other provinces."

But of the awful distinction of Cretan institutions, pederasty, the distinction actually bound up with having a lover, of sacrifices to Zeus actually performed in connection therewith, of incidental elopements, and a two months' (regulated) absence of the lads from their parents, Strabo writes in the present tense, quoting even the conventional forms of euphemism established and current; and at the end of it all we look in vain for one word of reproof from our Stoic analyst. These things are "institutional," no more to be said.

The Iberians in the Caucasus country (p. 503) worship particularly the moon. The man ranking next to the king serves as priest. There is extensive and fertile temple land; many "prophets" live from it; if any one of these strays away, he is put in "sacred chains" and fattened for a year, when, with other victims (of animal kind), he is sacrificed to the moon, having been sprinkled with sacred ointments; the archpriest pierces him with a sacred lance near the heart with a curious expert skill; the mode of his fall is interpreted as a kind of oracle; the body is conveyed to a certain spot where all tread upon it as a form of their own purification.

The moon-worship in Kabira in Pontus is similar (p. 557), with many attendant *hierodules* and lands for the archpriest. A delegated foundation (*aphidryma*) is that at Komana in Cappadocia, with the same doctrine, training, and ritual, carrying abroad of the goddess (*theophoria*) and honors of the priests. (This was the native region of Strabo.)

Komana now is populous (p. 559) and chief emporium for trade from Armenia. The goddess has certain "passages out" (probably the same as *theophoria*)

which are great festivals for both sexes, where vows are turned into sacrifices; there is a great abundance of "consecrated" girls, whose fees from visitors go to the sanctuary; the city, in a way, says Strabo, is a "little Corinth," where the abundance of temple courtesans causes an abundance of visitors.

Galatia, or Gallograecia (p. 566 *sqq.*), long maintained tribal distinctions from their Keltic origins, as well as the supreme court of the *Dru-nemetum* (Druid's grove), but now it is a Roman province; *i.e.*, no institution or practice is permitted which runs counter to Roman sovereignty. Otherwise Rome is unconcerned, especially as to religion.

Pessinus (p. 567) in Galatia is the greatest commercial place in the province, and also conspicuous as the seat of the Great Mother of the gods, from which the one at Rome was a delegated foundation,¹³ in consequence of a suggestion derived from the Sibylline books, as was the Aesculapius on the Tiber island in Rome, from the source-sanctuary at Epidaurus.

A certain tree in Pisidia furnished a balsam which the "superstitious," says Strabo, use for incense in sacrifice (p. 571). Between Laodicea and Karura there is a sanctuary called that of the Carian Moon, which is "notably honored" (p. 480). Not far from the Hellespont, in the Troad, was an oracle of Apollo Aktaios ("of the coast") and Artemis, transferred later, but now abandoned by cult or believers (p. 588). At Rhoiteion on the sea, in the Troad, was a tomb, sanctuary, and statue of Salaminian Ajax, which Antony carried off (p. 595) to "gratify the Egyptian woman," but Augustus restored it "to the gods." Other Trojan war heroes were still

¹³ In 205 B.C. Livy XXIX, 10, 11: Mater Idaea a Pessinunte Romam advecta.

honored there as "dwelling below;" the blood of a victim was poured or sacrificed into a pit to quicken the souls of the dead heroes (the Greek term is *enagizein*).

Sacrifices for a specific purpose¹⁴ were mainly of three kinds, for divination, by means of entrail-inspection, in the making of treaties with pertinent oaths, and for purification and expiation.

Locrian maidens were for centuries sent to Ilion annually to expiate the outrage perpetrated by Ajax (Oilei in the sanctuary of Pallas Athena (Strabo, p. 601). The cult-figure of Athena, Strabo observes, is now generally presented as standing; Homer has her sitting. Many of the ancient cult-figures are shown in this attitude, *e.g.*, at Phokaia, Massilia, Rome, Chios.

Clearly, at the beginning of the Christian Era many temples, particularly in central Greece, were abandoned or desolate, population having thinned out, and trade having gained different arteries. Pausanias in his day confirmed this in a striking manner.¹⁵ Many towns in Boeotia in Strabo's time were, as he puts it, but "traces" of the past. Thespieae alone, he says, and Tanagra, of all the Boeotian towns, are fairly preserved; "of the others, ruins and names have been left" (p. 410).

Passing over to the western coast of Asia Minor, where so much of St. Paul's great mission was accomplished, we notice that Strabo wrote in his old age, when the great earthquakes of 17 A.D. were recent events.¹⁶ In Ionia proper Ephesus still claimed pre-eminence, as founded by scions of Kodros of Athens (Strabo, p. 633) who were, socially, still called "kings" and enjoyed

¹⁴ Schoemann, vol. II, p. 247.

¹⁵ *E. g.*, at Sikyon, Nemea, Mycenae, Argos, Hysiae, Tiryns, Hermione, Nauplia, Sellasia, Gythion, all in the Peloponnesus. Cf. my *From Augustus to Augustine*, 1923, p. 62.

¹⁶ Strabo, p. 621, in the reign of Tiberius. Tacitus, *Annales* II, 26.

certain social public privileges together with priestly honors in the worship of the Eleusinian Demeter at Ephesus. This too a delegated foundation, or *aphidryma*. This town and Miletus are called the most eminent on that coastline (p. 634). The Ephesian Artemis (Diana) was the only Greek sanctuary which Xerxes had spared.

In Miletus (p. 635) Apollo "Oulios" is worshiped because he bestows health, and Artemis who serves women similarly. Helios and Selene are housed with these, because they make good temperature and weather, and they assign to these "epidemics and unexplained deaths." Near Miletus (p. 636) is a Carian village, Thymbria, where there is a cave with deadly exhalation, called the abode of Charon. Almost every headland was called Poseidion, sacred to the god of the sea. The vast Hera-sanctuary (p. 637) on Samos had in Strabo's time virtually become a great gallery of paintings, while the open skylight part, he adds, contains a collection of rare sculptures among which are "three colossal works by Myron placed on a single pedestal," which Antony took away and Augustus Caesar restored, *i. e.*, two of them, the Athena and Hercules; the Zeus he transferred to the Capitol in Rome, "having constructed a small shrine for it there."

We return a moment to Ephesus, of which a little later, in Nero's time, Seneca wrote that, with Alexandria, Ephesus ranked foremost in population (*Epist. M.* 102, 21). In this case Strabo had made a personal study of everything. The priests were eunuchs (p. 641) and enjoyed great honor, but virgins must always be associated with them. Customs have become a little lax, but the right of asylum is still maintained. Alexander had extended it to a stadium (seven-eighths mile) from the

temple proper, Mithradates a little further. Antony doubled the distance, but Augustus cancelled this extension, as it put the city in the power of the criminal classes. Ephesus then was, as Strabo adds, the greatest emporium for all Asia north of the Taurus range.

Among the notable buildings in Smyrna (p. 642) was a *metreon*, or temple of the Great Mother, and a temple of Homer with a cult-figure of the same.

At Magnesia on the Meander was a temple of Artemis Leukophryne (of the white brows) inferior to the Ephesian in size and wealth of *anathemata*, but excelling it in symmetry of architecture and in the skillful construction of the *sekos* which held the *agalma*, or cult-figure.

Tralles is rich; often a Trallian secures the honor of being appointed *Asiarches* (*cf.* Acts 19:31), which honor required great wealth in the appointee.

Near Nysa is a village which has a splendidly equipped grove and shrine of Pluto and Kore. The cave of Charon is situated above the grove; they say that the ailing and those devoted to the service of these gods go there and sojourn in the village near the cave, living with these priests who are experts and who practice incubation in their behalf and direct the treatment as suggested by the dreams. These are the ones who invoke the medical aid of the gods; they often conduct the suppliants into the cave and let them sit there quietly, waiting as in a lurking hole for a number of days, without food. Sometimes the sufferers (p. 650) pay attention also to their own dreams; still they use also mystery directors and counsellors as priests, for otherwise the spot is forbidden and deadly.

At the island of Kos (p. 657) the Asklepios sanctuary in the suburban district is very famous and full of

anathemata, among which is the famous Antigonos by the painter Apelles; there was there also the Aphrodite rising from the sea, which figure now is consecrated to the *divus Caesar*, in Rome, Augustus having consecrated her to his father, she being the *genetrix* of the Julian family. Augustus is said to have remitted to the people of Kos 100 talents from their imperial taxes, as a compensation.

Near Alabanda and Mylasa in Caria is an ancient temple (p. 659) and cult-figure of Zeus Stratios, honored by the people roundabout and by the citizens of Mylasa. There is a paved highway of some sixty stadia (seven and a half miles) called the sacred way, on which the sacred objects are carried in procession. The most notable citizens always hold the priestly office for life.

There is a further sanctuary or celebration of the Carian Zeus, in which the Lydians also and Mysians share as brothers.

The Parthians, or Persians, (p. 732) have no *agalmata* or altars; they sacrifice on the higher peaks to Zeus, also they honor (worship) the sun, which they call Mithras; they further honor the moon and Aphrodite and fire and the earth and winds and water. The magi supervise the ritual; these also are very numerous in Cappadocia. Fire is the chief object of their adoration.

Passing over Syria and Palestine (much discussed in my last two studies in this review), let us turn in conclusion to what was the richest and newest province of the Augustan Empire, Egypt, recalling the fact that Strabo, for the purpose of research, resided long in Alexandria. Avoiding generalizations let us select a number of concrete things related by Strabo from his own vision. He calls Alexandria (p. 798) the greatest emporium of the *oikumene*.

Now, one may say, 'But these data are Egyptian, not Greek.' Still in the long period from Alexander's death (323 B.C.) to the suicide of Cleopatra (30 B.C.) the Nile Kingdom had been a Greek state. If nothing else, this Strabonian survey will make it impressively clear how little refinement or elevation the Olympian religion, as held by the incestuous dynasty of the Lagidae, could or could bring to the native religions as practiced in the various nomes or districts of Egypt. At Kanobos (p. 801), 120 stadia east of Alexandria, is a sanctuary of Serapis honored with much worship, "so that even the most notable men believe in it and practice sleeping in it [incubation], either in behalf of themselves or others. Some even wrote out accounts of the treatments or of the oracle-responses there given." At Saïs, the mother city of Lower Egypt (p. 802) they honor (*i.e.*, worship) Athena (Isis); in her sanctuary is the tomb of King Psammetichus. At Mendes in the Delta they "honor" Pan, and of beasts the he goat. At Momemphis (p. 803) they honor Aphrodite and a sacred cow is kept there, just as the Apis-steer in Memphis and the *mnevis* (an ox) at Heliupolis; these are considered gods there, others with others, animals of different sexes here and there, without any agreement of practice.

In the nitric district south of Momemphis Serapis is honored, and there alone in Egypt the sheep is sacrificed. A little above Saïs is the asylum of Osiris, where they say Osiris lies. There is, Strabo adds, much controversy about this; for they tell the myth in upper Egypt above Syene and Elephantine, that Isis placed coffins of Osiris in many places all over the face of the earth,¹⁷ and that she did this to deceive Typhon lest he

¹⁷ Cf. Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, From Augustus to Augustine, p. 58. It is extremely unlikely that the Isis worshipers "interpreted the legend in a pious and philosophical manner," as Plutarch says they ought to.

might come and tear the body from the tomb. In most Egyptian temples, he says in a general survey (p. 805), there is no cult-figure, or there is one not man-shaped, but of some dumb beast or other. Strabo dislikes the architecture of their temples as having nothing "graceful or picturesque" (p. 806). Memphis, the royal city of older Egypt (p. 807), has sanctuaries of note, such as that of Apis, "who is identical with Osiris," where that steer is kept in a sacred enclosure, "held as a god," with white forehead and certain other minor marks of body, but otherwise black, "by which signs they always judge the one suitable for succession when the one who had the honor has passed away." There is in Memphis also a sanctuary of Aphrodite, rated a Greek divinity. The city ranks next to Alexandria.

The Serapeum is almost buried by sand. In Kynopolis (dog-town) Anubis, the dog-faced god and page of Isis, is worshiped (p. 812), and for the dog's honor a kind of sacred feeding is regularly provided. Across the river is the town Oxyrynchos (sharp snout), name of a fish, a spot now famous through discovery of papyri, and nome of same name. That fish is honored there and has a sanctuary, "although the other Egyptians also commonly honor the oxyrynchos. For some of the animals all the Egyptians commonly honor, just as of quadrupeds, three, viz., ox, dog, cat; and of birds, two, viz., the hawk and ibis; and of fish, two, viz., the scaly fish and the oxyrynchos."

"Having said much about Ammon we wish to add so much, viz., that divination and the oracles were [once] more in honor, but at the present time a great neglect prevails, the Romans being satisfied with the Sibylline oracles and the Etruscan haruspices" (p. 813). At Tentyra (modern Denderah) on the Upper Nile (p.

814) the crocodile is worshiped. The queen Kandake is mentioned (p. 820), who "in our times ruled over the Ethiopians, a mannish sort of woman."

Note. It seems wise to make some excerpts also from the second book of Herodotus, whose observations and remarks, although some 400 years earlier (before Strabo resided in Alexandria and traveled up the Nile), still in the main confirm the later writer and help us to realize how little, if at all, the Egyptian religion was changed or modified either by the Persian overlords or by the Lagid Macedonian dynasty.

"I am avoiding all subjective theorizing, but am merely writing down what I hear from each." Herodotus says (II, 123): "The Egyptians say that the rulers of those below are Demeter and Dionysos. And the Egyptians also are the first who said that man's soul is immortal, and, while the body passes away, it [the soul] enters into another living being as such is born from time to time; and when it has made the rounds of all the animals on land and sea and birds, that then at birth it enters again into a human body and that that circular passage is accomplished in three thousand years. There are Greeks who adopted this doctrine, some earlier and some later, as though it were their own, whose names I know, but will not write down here. [The Herakles-Melkart worship on the Greek island of Thasos, so the priests at Tyre claimed, was a delegated foundation from Tyre. II, 44.] The Egyptians do not all in a similar manner venerate the same gods [II, 42] except Isis and Osiris, of whom they say that he is Dionysos." The Mendians abstain from goats (so too, Strabo). The people of Thebes say that Hercules wished to see Zeus, who refused; but in the end, as Hercules begged persistently, Zeus flayed a ram and put the ram's head in front of his own, while dressing himself in the fleece, and thus displayed himself to Hercules. It is from this that the Egyptians make the cult-figure of Zeus ram-faced (and so Jupiter Ammon had ram's horns on the side of his face). The act is pantomimically represented on one day in the year at Thebes. The priests then bury the dead ram in the same tomb. The Egyptians practice circumcision for the sake of cleanliness (II, 37). The priests shave their entire body every third day, in order that they may have neither lice nor any other abomination come to them while they are worshiping the gods. An ample supply of beef and goose is daily provided for the priests, and wine from the grape.

Beans are rigidly prohibited (so too by Pythagoras). Priests may not even see them. Each god has many priests. One is archpriest, whose son always succeeds after his father's death.

Cows may not be sacrificed (II, 41); they are sacred to Isis, whose cult-figure has the horns of a cow. As for Pan, the Mendians reckon him as one of the eight gods and say these eight were born before the twelve gods. Pan is represented with a goat's face and goat's legs just as by the Greeks (II, 46). Swine are an abomination (II, 47). Swineherds are not permitted to enter into any Egyptian sanctuary. Socially they are pariahs. So far Herodotus.

I close this essay with a necessary monition. All elements of what we comprehensively call Hellenic civilization have been studied and restudied and analyzed by scores of classicists with microscopic and often micrological devotion. To many persons the term "Greek," let alone "Hellenic," connotes something ineffable, or humanly perfect; this not only with professional classicists as a rule, but also with those in the forecourts of the Philistine world. It is a tradition, from Filelfo to these days.

Now the phenomena of idolatry and correlated worship must not gain any higher valuation or honor simply because they have come to us from the most gifted ethnic group of the ancient world. The efforts, from Porphyry and Iamblichus down to recent antiquarians like Cumont and his followers, to interpret spirituality or soul commanding power into Isis or the Orphica or the bull-slaughtering and blood-baptism in the caves of the Mithras-cult, may seem important to such antiquarians and their academic following and to the faddists of comparative religion—their lucubrations and adumbrations are sometimes sophomoric, often pretentious, always futile and wide of the mark. Greek religion is not an archeological museum, where mandatory ecstasy is prescribed for all that enter the fane.

Often, particularly when wandering once more through the galleries of Italy and passing once more by the great creative artists of the Renaissance, I have pondered on the striking dissonance between Michael Angelo of the Sistine Chapel and the one who painted Leda with the Swan, or between Titian's Tribute Money and his Danae or his uncovered Venus. The spiritual history of the Italian *Risorgimento*, with its Boccaccio, Filelfo, Valla, Beccadelli, Poggio, Politian, meant neopaganism and emancipation of the flesh. And as to the mystery religions, and particularly the Isiac forms of the same, one may well cite here from Plutarch an utterance of Xenophanes (Plutarch: *De Superstitione*, 171, E.), "If these are gods, do not wait for them; if men, do not sacrifice to them."

The "gods" of Greece were simply men (and women), lustful, vindictive, quarrelsome, proud, exponents of every form of nonspiritual humanity, the god's chief privilege being his endurance. The coming and passing of life and the civic interests and nebulous traditions of the given community constitute the main sphere of "religious" concerns. Phallic processions of women, wives and mothers I mean, occurred regularly in Greek communities, and were practiced in Egypt as well, and one of the chief concerns of the periodically widowed Isis was of this kind. Futile and fanciful efforts have been made from Clement of Alexandria down, even now, to dovetail Platonic visions into the essence, nay into the beginnings, of the Christian faith. I close with some final utterances of Naegelsbach in his *Nachhomerische Theologie* (1857, p. 476), with which I find myself in cordial agreement:

"Every religion is based on facts: false Religion on fanciful ones, true Religion on actual ones, and such are

lacking to speculation. [He refers to Platonic speculation.] This indeed attempts to furnish an answer to the three main questions which man directs at any religion: 'does God exist and what is he? How does man rid himself of his sin? What is his lot after death?' . . . But what it [Platonic metaphysics] says, remains speculation; it has in its favor neither a clean-cut attestation of Conscience, nor objective facts. Hence this speculation never found attestation in the hearts of the people, has no power to vanquish the world, but is rather broken to bits in philosophical sects and becomes a matter for erudition mainly."

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

ONE OF THE MOST AMAZING THINGS ABOUT THE ESSENTIAL truths of Christianity is their capacity to endure reiteration. Imagine any political doctrine retaining its force if it were as continually presented by writers and speakers as are any of the central doctrines of the faith. These religious utterances are like those faithful bells along the coast, whose tones the mariner dreads to hear, yet anxiously listens for.

How often has the meaning of the cross been put into words, yet how its beauty and its glory and its power increase with the telling. There is offered an instance of this in one of the opening addresses of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm. Principal Alfred E. Garvie of New College, Hampstead, London, when speaking even before that august assembly, took a moment for this restatement of the place of the cross, which will especially interest the reader of Dr. Poteat's paper, *The Death of Jesus*:

"Central to the Christian conception of God is the revelation of the Cross of Christ, the salvation of man from sin by the sacrifice of God. That God might reproduce his perfection in man, that is, realize his Fatherhood, man must be reconciled to God, and redeemed from sin; the hindrance to his relation as child to God as Father, due to sin, must be removed. The guilt of sin must be canceled and its power over man ended. In the forgiveness of sin the Divine judgment on the sin no longer falls on the sinner, who, by his penitence and faith, has separated himself from his sin and attached himself to God, and God's favour, no longer impeded by his sin, freely and fully rests upon him. By the new motive of gratitude for forgiveness the hold of sin is loosened, and by the power of the Spirit given to all united to Christ by faith as Saviour and Lord is the victory over sin completed. This reconciliation and redemption

comes to man in Christ's Cross through the faith which the grace there displayed evokes. Without now attempting to show how this salvation of man is connected with this sacrifice of God, as Christian experience permanently and universally attests, it must suffice to indicate that in this grace God shows Himself fellow-sufferer with man, and in this faith man proves himself fellow-worker with God. Thus is the fellowship of man with God maintained, and the likeness of man to God attained; the Fatherhood revealed and the sonship realized."

IT SEEMS LIKE A MERE TRUISM TO SAY THAT THE HEART OF Christianity is Christ, yet the church does not fully apprehend the force of that statement. We have permitted the truth about Christ and His work for us and in us to become so incrustated with doctrines and theories and ideas upon everything connected with our religion that its simplicity is supplanted by a formidable theological system. Theology has its place, but in dealing with the soul seeking peace and light it cannot be any substitute for contact with the Saviour Himself. Moreover, when one has become right with God through Christ he is in the best possible position to consider the philosophy of his faith.

A persistent phenomenon of Christian history is the power of souls that have become utterly enwrapped in the very being of their Lord. They themselves become the proof of what they hold and preach. A modern case is that of Sadhu Sundar Singh, the Indian evangelist, whose life is so remarkable that upwards of thirty-five different accounts of it have been published, in various languages. The Lutheran has devoted a long editorial to this "modern apostolic marvel," and thus describes his conversion and spiritual life:

"Like Luther, when he was but sixteen years of age, his yearnings for peace and reconciliation with God drove him to despair. Buddhism had awakened in him longings which it could not satisfy. It had said to him, 'This do and thou shalt live,' and he went to the limit of enduring pains and sacrifices, as prescribed, that he might gain life and peace by doing. All was in vain, and in his agony he concluded to commit suicide in the hope that he might in the other life find

the peace that was denied him in this. At this point, he parts company with Luther and gets into line with Paul. Before carrying out his purpose, he poured out his heart into an agonizing prayer that God would come to his rescue and give him the peace he craved. The answer came in the form of a vision of Christ whom he heard saying to him: 'Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden and I will give you rest,' and those other words once spoken to Nicodemus, 'God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life.' Peace came as a refreshing shower after a long dearth, and to him ever since Christ is no longer the historic personality who suffered and died on the cross but a living, ever-present Christ with whom he is in daily communion and from whom he receives daily inspiration and revelation. He insists that the Christian must not separate the two worlds in which he lives, but must begin his Heaven here and live in it, so as to make the transition at death not a rude and unnatural break, but like a joyful sailing from an inlet out into the boundless main of eternity.

"Here is a man whose dwelling place is in the realm of the supernatural. He breathes its atmosphere and becomes so thoroughly acclimated in it as to make the supernatural the most natural thing to him in the world. He relates wonderful experiences at which theologians shake their heads and which the rationalistic psychologists are trying hard to explain. To those who doubt miracles he says with quiet but firm assurance: 'The day of miracles has not passed; it is the day of faith that has passed.' So natural to him have the wonders of his experiences become that he takes them as a matter of course, and avoids talking about them unless the occasion seems to require it. He refuses to pose as a miracle worker, though often in his missionary tours he is appealed to by people in sore distress to exercise that gift, as Christ and the Apostles did. His answer is, 'I am sent not to work miracles in nature but to preach Christ that the greatest of all miracles may be performed in you.' On one occasion the appeal of a mother for the restoration of a son sick unto death became so strong that he yielded, took the son by the hand and in the name of Jesus restored him to health,—one more problem in this man's eventful life for psychologists to explain.

"Here then is an evangelist of the primitive Apostolic type. The same grasp of the living Christ which the disciples had after they had seen their risen Lord, and which Paul had when

on his way to Damascus, that same divine afflatus and unction which burned in their bosoms and made them powerful witnesses for Christ, is strikingly manifest in this modern herald of salvation."

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS A DIVINELY FOUNDED INSTITUTION, and the Bible is a divinely given book, but neither was intended to be an object of worship in itself. The supreme purpose of each is to present Christ to the world. Yet these essential facts are often forgotten, even by individuals who are extremely zealous in defending the Scriptures or in working for the church. The Lord Himself really has second place in the thoughts of some who are much concerned over these instrumentalities for presenting Him to the world. The Southern Churchman has pointed out this mistake and danger in this editorial passage:

"It is a strange but startling fact that the exaltation of the Church has always stood in inverse relation to the world's appreciation of its Lord. The reason is not hard to see. The exaltation of the Church, whatever the words may be supposed to mean, means the exaltation of the hierarchy, until they are endowed with divine attributes, and the worship of the Church substituted for the worship of its Lord. The tragedy of the ultra Protestant position is hardly less; for the worship of the Book is just as well-defined a mark of idolatry in Christianity as worship of the Book among Mohammedans, or among the cults of India. The proof of Christianity is neither Church nor Bible; but the Living Christ in the hearts and lives of men; and if He be not there, neither Church nor Bible, nor both, can keep open the road from earth to heaven."

THE MASS OF OUR CHURCH MEMBERS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT morals, education, social uplift, civic betterment, and the whole list of specific remedies for a sick world; but somehow God Himself, as revealed in His Son, seems to have been pushed into the background of most minds, if they think of Him at all. Yet the presence of God in the heart is one of the most comforting as well as one of the most important of all the blessings promised in the Scriptures. "If a man love me, he will keep my

word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

If the church is to be quickened and made effective, its members must enjoy the intimate friendship of their Lord, must "practice the presence of God." In closing an editorial on this theme *The Christian*, London, says:

"The whole revelation of God, the whole message of Old and New Testaments alike, is bound up with the Presence of the Lord. That is the sole hope of His people both for this life and for the next.

"And what is the chief reflection which that unquestionable fact ought to impress upon the earnest believer? Is it not just this—the intensely *personal* nature of the Christian revelation, and of the relation between him and his Lord?

"As it has truly been said, Christianity *is* Christ. Christian experience is not a matter of influences merely, however noble; nor of gifts merely, however freely offered and gratefully accepted; but above and behind all these it is a matter of vital relationships. As once more it has been expressed, it is 'not "it," but "Christ".' That is a Scriptural representation of the matter. For 'as many as receive *Him*, to them gave He the right to become children of God.' They receive His gift of salvation and life; and it is a free gift and a glorious salvation: but they receive it because they receive Him. Those who seek the experience of Christianity rather than the Person of Christ are always disappointed with the result. And it is the same with the gifts and graces for victory and service. The indwelling Christ, the personal Holy Spirit, are the secret of blessing, security, peace, and power here—and the pledge of glory hereafter in the Presence more clearly manifested."

SOME CHRISTIAN PEOPLE ARE LIKE FINELY CONSTRUCTED machines, built for turning out excellent work, but lacking one thing—they have no driving power in themselves. Their lives are spotless, their intentions of the best, and their intelligence above the average, yet they are religious nonproducers. They seem afraid of enthusiasm, and so take hold of nothing with any ardor, any passion, that insures success. They are sometimes useful under a compelling leader who has a genius for getting action into folks, but soon lapse when he is gone. What

they need is to develop a motive power of their own by coming into contact with the great Source of power, so that they may go on increasing in good works independently as regards human urging. The relation of this divine passion to successful Christian life and flourishing church activity is shown in a passage from an article on *The Religion of the Burning Heart*, by C. H. Ballard in *The New Outlook*:

"In modern times much new light has come to the Church through wide Biblical scholarship and scientific learning. Her present need is more heat, a red-hot enthusiasm! Lukewarmness has paralyzed, and coldness has frozen up the spiritual life of many a congregation; and in not a few cases the very people who complain of the 'chilly atmosphere,' the unsocial spirit of their church, are themselves the religious icicles who have been only 'hangers-on,' too cold and hard to promote the warmth of friendliness in the Church. A congregation of the Emmaus type of disciples are not likely to find fault with their church for being 'cold' in its atmosphere.

"As a Divine crusade, Christianity has flourished only when it has been a flaming passion; intensity is its true temper. Our great Exemplar was ever aflame with a Divine zeal for the cause of God and humanity. There burned in the heart of Jesus the heavenly fire of the Eternal Father's love for mankind. The Son of God was not merely our Prophet or Priest; He was the Incarnation of the love of God. Like a powerful magnifying glass, He gathered up and focused in His personality the bright warm rays of eternal love, so that the men who companied with Him felt their souls warmed with a flame so pure and so intense that they knew themselves to be in real contact with God. All the true fellow-laborers of God have been redeemed souls, burning with the zeal of a heaven-born passion, the fire of Divine Love. This fire in Peter's heart could not be quenched by threats of imprisonment. Hardship and sufferings could not daunt Paul's heroic passion. Not all the power of the Medici could crush the spirit of Savonarola. No danger or threat could turn back the fiery Luther. Great hearts like Knox, Bunyan, Wesley and Whitefield could not be baffled or bought. They were flaming torches lighted by 'the God who answereth by fire.'"

THE EDUCATION THAT COMES THROUGH LEARNED TEACHERS AND books is of the cumulative kind. It gathers up all that is known

on a subject and delivers it to the student in orderly form. It is inherited knowledge, bequeathed by all those whose patient toil and first hand study of the material has added to the general sum of what is known. The general progress of the race in any direction is dependent on this gradual accretion of knowledge. What would chemistry amount to if each student were deprived of all previous knowledge of matter and were obliged to learn only by his own groping investigations?

And yet, if one depends entirely upon what is handed down to him, if his relations with the materials of study consist in following methods and repeating experiments that originated with others, he misses the finest element of all knowledge—that intimacy of the soul with reality itself, undimmed by the mediation of other minds. This is one of the compensations of those obliged to work much alone, away from an academic atmosphere that sometimes warms rather than invigorates.

We see this sometimes in the case of the country doctor of long experience, who has continually had to depend upon his own resources and who has often been obliged to treat human nature as a whole, as well as the human body. If he has a good mind, he comes in his long years of experience to see deeply, to lay hold upon ultimate things. One of this fine type, Dr. Thomas Wilson, some of whose recollections and remarks were reported by Allan Harding in *The American Magazine*, has given an emphatic testimony to the Christian faith as it was borne in upon him by over fifty years' experience. After speaking of the nature of death he continued:

"I do not see how any physician could know death as I have known it without acknowledging the power of religion. If he worked only in his laboratory, absorbed in material things, possibly he might be a materialist. But if, again and again, he has seen death glorified by faith in a living God, it is inconceivable to me that he can be without that faith himself."

ONE OF THE PERILS OF LEARNING IS SELF-SATISFACTION, THE feeling that one has worked out the answers to the great problems of existence, and has discovered that only his own efforts

are to determine his destiny. This is why it is very hard for the highly cultured to humble themselves and become as little children that they may learn to comprehend spiritual things. Thomas L. Masson, writing in *The Christian Century* upon *The Faith of a Humorist*, touches upon this point:

"Advanced spiritual development is much more common and much easier among the unlearned than among the learned. An educated person betrays a certain amount of material ease. These attachments, namely, learning and material ease, must be swept aside to attain true spiritual development. To make any advance at all, I found it was necessary to abandon everything that goes to make up the life of the senses. By this I do not mean at all selling out, or necessarily giving up reading and study. I mean simply that one must detach oneself utterly from the thought of these things, so that one rises above them, becomes detached from them in the sense of being quite willing to give them up at any moment.

"Most of the people who come to me for help have either traveled the circle of spiritual specialists or are going around. For there are spiritual specialists just the same as there are medical specialists. These pathetic people, seeking help, are looking for someone to give them peace, or a way to make a living or how to get on with those who are close to them. They therefore go from one prop to another. In each instance, they think, momentarily, that they have found peace, and are quite likely to crow about it. It takes but little time however for them to exhaust their prop, and they transfer their spiritual affections to another.

"There is no prop except yourself and God. The very conditions of *right* spiritual progress depend upon being always dissatisfied. The human consciousness is not stable. Its very instability gives the direction, namely absolute dependence upon the unknown, or God."

HAVE THINGS REACHED A POINT WHERE THE SOUNDLY CONSERVATIVE church feels the necessity of sending a kind of missionary to the college, in order to guard the spiritual interests of students who have to meet there the attacks of agnosticism? It would seem so, in some cases at least. The first duty of the church, however, is to see that her young people are prepared

for this experience, first, by being firmly grounded in their faith, and, secondly, by being forewarned and forearmed relative to the anti-Christian teaching they may meet. The Lutheran meets this problem in an editorial, given here in part, and this advice, with denominational adaptations, should be heeded by all the churches:

"If there is one matter of outstanding importance which has been impressed upon us, it is the urgent necessity of pastoral work in the congregation among young men and women who are contemplating going to the university, or other high-grade schools not under church control. As every one knows, that is where intellectual attainments are stressed almost to the complete exclusion of the moral and the spiritual. There is where a young man or young woman first begins to grapple with the scientific and intellectual problems which our modern higher education is chiefly concerned about. There is where they first begin to place side by side what they have been taught in the catechetical class and what they are being taught by exponents of the modern naturalistic school of scientific and philosophical thought. There is where they first learn of the conflict between the two and where they first begin to question and to doubt. Their education in the parish has been almost exclusively scriptural and spiritual, and they have not subjected their faith to the intellectual tests which the scholastic atmosphere of a university suddenly thrusts upon them. They enter the university as novices, become inoculated with the virus of agnosticism and unbelief, and leave it too often, alas, as those who have made shipwreck of their faith.

"Our student pastors have become an absolute necessity, and we cannot have too many of them. They take the novice in hand at a time when he first begins to measure his faith with a scientific or intellectual yardstick. They at once discover that questions, which are much in the limelight in modern thinking and are dealt with in magazines and books where speculation is held in higher esteem than the Christian faith, are entirely new to him and that he is pitifully helpless to cope with them."

IT HAS BEEN REMARKED THAT THE FORM OF RELIGIOUS RADICALISM called Modernism has exhausted its resources in the way of argument and is now merely reiterating its objections to the

evangelical position. However this may be, it does seem to be true that some individuals at least, in the liberal camp, are showing signs of disappointment, disillusion, and even serious concern over the negative results of Modernism.

A significant case is found in an anonymous article in *The Atlantic Monthly* under the title, *The Modernist's Quest for God*. The writer describes himself as reared in the orthodox evangelical faith, but trained for the ministry in a seminary where liberal views were freely held. The title of the article does not suggest its tone, for it amounts to the plaint of one who discovers that he has been sadly misled in his search for what is highest and best. He seems still to follow Modernism, but it is with that dull and plodding loyalty that has lost all enthusiasm and much faith. Indeed, were it not for the fine character of the periodical through which he pours out his feeling, one might suspect that the writer is really a conservative assuming a liberal role in order to strike a covert blow.

In speaking of his early attraction to liberalism and his later discovery of the widely divergent views among Modernists themselves, he reveals the extremes to which Modernism may lead when he says:

"Not every one of my seminary contemporaries of those pre-war days found the complete satisfaction of this new religion. Most of us had to suppress, at times, doubts of one sort or another. But in general, and for a considerable number, Liberal Christianity seemed as strong as it was delightful. We had God without the Devil, an eternal Heaven without necessarily an eternal Hell. Truth and Beauty, we were assured, must prevail and Evil be vanquished, for God is Love.

"As I look over this description of Modernism I realize its inadequacy. For one thing, Modernism is amorphous, and there are wide divergences within it. Some of its adherents believe more than I have indicated and some less. I was amazed recently to discover in a club of young clergymen how many rejected a belief in immortality. They accepted it neither on the arguments of philosophy nor on the authority of revealed religion. As for the alleged scientific proof of psychical research; that seemed to disclose an immortality so petty and dull that extinction were a boom to be coveted. All these doubters were

in the Church. Toward the Church itself Modernists greatly differ in point of view. Some, curiously enough, are High Churchmen; some are Low. Likewise a difference in emphasis exists with regard to the social gospel, some theological Liberals being hidebound social Conservatives. It is not without significance that Modernism in America so far has found its strength, not among the masses, but among the well-to-do. It is more at home on Fifth Avenue than on Main Street."

After admitting theological difficulties that confront even the Modernist's faith, he shows how the Great War compelled him to face these questions and how it revealed the inconsistency of Modernist leaders. Then he makes this singularly frank confession of the individual and social failure of this school:

"And this failure of the Modernists in war-time, as I sadly came to believe, was not a personal dereliction in time of extraordinary strain. It was of a piece with their general failure to bring to our struggling world either vision or courage for its salvation. Fundamentalism at its best—for example, in some of the work of the Salvation Army—has to its credit the dramatic healing of sick souls. Who ever heard similar tales of twice-born men as proofs of the living power of the Modernist word?

"But there is the social gospel. In so far as it is identified with Modernism it is one of its chief ornaments. I have no desire to minimize its past achievements or future possibilities. But out of much experience I am compelled to assert that this social gospel, at least in America, has made little impression upon the working class, among whom Christianity had its origin; that it has made no original contribution to social theory; and that it has not so much reinterpreted Jesus to our time as weakened the staggering challenge of His teaching to a generation which finds His utter unconcern in the processes of production and distribution well-nigh incomprehensible.

"This last assertion may be met with a multitude of conflicting statements as to what we really know about Jesus and His teaching. I know that some of these interpretations make Him the prophet of a gradual and wholly practicable programme of social amelioration, by which we shall all eventually become well-to-do, if not rich, and yet get through the eye of the needle. Others make him scarcely more than a pious Jew-

ish fanatic. Here it is less important to argue the validity of these interpretations than to point out the havoc wrought to Modernism by its own conflicting statements as to what Jesus really said and did. How shall our perplexed world be expected to look for commanding leadership to a figure about whom and whose teaching critical scholars cannot more nearly agree? And if He is to be reduced to the stature of His portrait by such Christian critics as Kirsopp Lake, what, in heaven's name, have we left of distinctive Christianity? Behind all such queries lies the more fundamental problem: Can any man who lived in the first century be the adequate guide for men who live in the twentieth, with its vastly different scientific outlook and social and economic organization?

"It is such questions as these that have compelled me, sorrowing, to doubt the real vitality or significance of Modernism. More than it realizes, it is living on its inherited capital—the stored-up memories and affections that gather about a traditional faith and the art and poetry of Christianity. As one of its most eloquent expounders said, in a moment of discouragement: 'I preach on many things, but always on the periphery of life. Sometimes I think I am afraid to tackle the central problem.' That central problem, he went on to say, is the question of God and His relation to men. Has He made us, given us such lofty aspirations and glorious dreams, only to leave us to the mercy of the stupidities and fears and prejudices which lead us, scarcely knowing what we do, into the prison house of our own acquisitive society and its inevitable wars? Are not these great human incapacities as truly His gift as our dreams? Shall we be saved by faith in Him or by a stern endeavor to take the universe and ourselves as we find them and then to see at what points we can remould our life nearer to the highest aspiration of our race? Has the Modernistic interpretation of the Christian, Jewish, or any other ancient religious faith an answer to these questions in terms of a great and convincing affirmation of God?

"Perhaps; but thousands of us who have strained our ears do not hear that word. Neither do we see in the lives of those who profess to have heard it satisfactory evidence of its power. They who claim to know the supremacy of a God of Love looked not to love but to illimitable violence for their protection in the great emergency of war. In their daily lives they too are caught in the shoddy meshes of compromise that we know so well. What, then, does it avail to tell us of some inner comfort they

derive? If we are worthy of the quest of Truth we cannot turn aside to enter any paradise of illusion."

NOT VERY LONG AGO SIXTEEN PROTESTANTS WERE RECEIVED into a Chicago Roman Catholic Church. According to The Continent this church had a Protestant organist who was so curious to know what was back of this small exodus from the evangelical churches that he asked the parish priest about it. This answer, as reported, is too sweeping in its criticism of Protestant shortcomings in the matter of teaching, yet it is by no means without foundation, and confirms similar testimony, that Protestants are not as a class being grounded in the doctrines of their faith:

"There was a time when Protestants believed something and taught something. That time has gone by, except for the Lutherans and a few others. Protestant churches are mainly social organizations, with all sorts of clubs and activities, recreational and pleasure programs, with a little spiritual seasoning in the form of a denatured church service and a haphazard Sunday school meeting thrown in. The heart of the church service is the music, with an exhortation to goodness or moral conduct, or a discussion of some social problems or economic situation thrown in, in the form of a sermon.

"What is the result? Protestant people are spiritually starved. Ninety-nine out of a hundred cannot tell even the most elementary things which they believe as distinctly Protestant. They are not being taught anything. The result is that the only hold upon them is loyalty to an organization, not religious conviction. On the other hand, our church teaches the Catholic religion all the way from childhood up—and our people know what they believe. Most of them stick. Protestants see that we believe something and, being spiritually hungry, they are susceptible to our appeals. Then, too, we maintain an order—the Paulist Fathers—devoted exclusively to the conversion of non-Catholics to Catholicism. They do not threaten or brow-beat people emotionally into the Roman church. They reason and teach.

"The result is a harvest of non-Catholics for our church. If Protestantism is wise, it will make religious teaching its main theme, and all these other things secondary."

IT CAN NOT BE GAINSAID, INDEED, THAT ONE OF THE MOST SERIOUS charges against our present day Protestantism is, that it fails to an appalling degree in teaching the essentials of its faith. There are vast numbers of our church members who cannot give any clear account of the meaning of Christ's mission to the world, of the difference between the Atonement and the practice of good morals, of the regenerating work of the Spirit, of the central duty of the church, or of any other of the elements that make Christianity what it is.

Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, in a letter to The Presbyterian, after commenting on the Chicago priest's criticism upon Protestantism's failure to train the young, already quoted, continues:

"But will Protestantism be wise? Well do I remember one instruction class for the communion. The only one in the class who could answer quickly and intelligently questions about the Bible, the Trinity, the Person of Christ, the twelve apostles, was a young man who had been trained by a Catholic mother!

"On the ship coming home from Europe last summer, I had several conversations with a priest who is one of a group to go about conducting missions for the Protestants. He said to me: 'The astounding thing, the sad thing about these converts whom we are gaining is that they are not converts from Protestantism, but converts from agnosticism, or utter materialism, although outwardly Protestants.'

"Whatsoever a church soweth, that also shall it reap! Many of our Protestant Churches have been sowing unbelief in the Bible, disrespect for the Lord Jesus Christ, disregard for life to come, and the terrible harvest is now being reaped."

THERE APPEARS TO BE A REVIVAL OF INTEREST IN THE QUESTION of the difference between the Catholic and Protestant systems. This is one of the products of the general religious ferment of the time and is more specifically occasioned by the present wave of great Catholic activity on the Continent and the Anglo-Catholic movement in England.

Only the intensely narrow minded in either communion can see no good in the other. Both have virtues and both have faults. Principal W. B. Selbie of Mansfield College, Oxford,

has been contributing a series of articles to *The Continent* on the general subject of Protestantism. In dealing with the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism he has these clear and illuminating paragraphs:

"It is now no longer possible to conceal the fact that the terms Catholic and Protestant stand for two different types of religion rather than for complementary interpretations of the same religion. They differ fundamentally in their idea of God and of man's relation to him. The one is a religion of order and authority, the other of freedom and of faith. The one belongs to man's spiritual tutelage, and provides him with the helps and crutches which his immaturity needs. The other claims the full power of his manhood, and leads him on to an ever clearer apprehension of God's truth. The one is static, while the other is dynamic.

"That Catholicism should very specially appeal to the men and women of this generation is no matter for surprise. Its power lies, not merely in its emotional and esthetic attraction, but in the fact that it offers a very real refuge to the spiritually and intellectually destitute. It claims to do their thinking for them and in a perplexed and godless world to provide them with a refuge and a defense. It hedges religion round with a strictness of ceremonial and an exactness of doctrine such as provide a safe road for wavering feet. There are multitudes of people today to whom Christianity presents a maze of intellectual perplexities which they simply dare not face for themselves. Their motto is 'safety first.' They gladly put themselves under direction, and welcome any church whose ipse dixit they can accept and in it find the assurance they crave.

"Such a system must inevitably exalt the external and mechanical aspects of religion at the expense of those which are inward and personal. It tends to read the will of God in terms of action. What he requires of men is better stated in terms of order and ritual than in those of faith and morals. This makes for discipline, no doubt, but it also makes for slavery, and so narrows down the way of approach to God that few indeed can find it. However strongly they may protest against the charge, Catholics do tend to put the church and the priest between men and God. St. Peter possesses the keys of the kingdom, and the man whom the church has duly authorized, and he alone, has the right to admit to the covenant mercies of God. The quality of mercy is strained through the narrow sieve of priestly order

and direction, and the way to God is barred to all save those who approach him through the duly authorized channels.

"Protestantism, on the other hand, stands for freedom and for the soul's right of direct access to God. In the past it has, no doubt, often led to an exaggerated individualism, and to a diversity of operations which has seemed to involve something like chaos. But even this is better than the rigid order of the Catholic system. Freedom is a great gift, and involves serious risks. But it is worth all the price that has to be paid for it. When Luther said that 'the Christian man is the free lord of all and subject to none,' he was building better than he knew, and opening a new and effectual door for the human spirit.

"The Protestant goes back with confidence to the fountain-head of Christianity in the teaching of Jesus Christ and the example of the early church. Jesus himself was a living protest against the very type of religion for which Catholicism stands. He confronted a system which bound heavy burdens upon men's shoulders and tended to shut God out from their lives. It produced an artificial morality, and reduced religion to a ritual. In the stress he laid on the value of the individual in God's sight, and in the free invitation he gave to sinners to come to God through him, Jesus broke down once for all the careful barriers which men had erected round God.

"This individual right of access to God Protestants regard as their inalienable heritage, and they derive it directly from the teaching and example of their Lord. The freedom it involves is by no means incompatible with order, but it is order of a moral and spiritual rather than of a mechanical kind. That men should approach God in the right spirit through repentance and faith goes without saying. But it is a very different thing to insist that priesthood and sacraments are equally necessary. That way lies the danger of substituting the latter for the former, a danger from which Catholicism has never been altogether free. The one foundation of the Protestant church is Jesus Christ her Lord. Faith in him and free access to God through him are its essential notes. In view of the teaching of Jesus, infallibility, whether of church, dogma or Bible, becomes unnecessary and impertinent. Salvation is through him alone, and the way is open."

IT IS NO UNCOMMON THING FOR UNCHRISTIANIZED PORTIONS OF the earth to furnish instances of remarkable spiritual awaken-

ing and longing for the truth. Some spark blown by the winds of Heaven has found lodgment and has kindled a flame of real religious fervor in men's hearts, and it needs only instruction and encouragement to evangelize a whole people.

Africa furnishes a recent phenomenon of this kind, reported by Rev. W. J. Pratt, chairman of the French West African mission district of the Wesleyan Church. In the course of an investigation he was making relative to the dialect used in the Grand Bassam country he went up there, and this, in his own words, as reported in the *Daily Chronicle*, is what he found:

"In village after village, along the Great Lagoon and up-country, I found isolated companies of avowed Christians, eager to receive and welcome a teacher. I was met everywhere with almost delirious joy, waving flags, brass bands, and great crowds of men, women and children. In all the villages of the coast and the Great Lagoon, and for a distance yet unknown in the interior, there are groups of men and women who have wholly abandoned the fetishism in which they were reared. They meet at least twice each Sunday to sing hymns, to pray, and to encourage each other in the worship of God as best they can, for their knowledge of the faith which they have adopted in such a wonderful way is, of course, very primitive. It is extraordinary that these untaught people have set apart a Sabbath Day, and, without any help from outside, are striving to retain their glimmerings of Christian truths. They are really thirsting for religious teaching, and I preached to a remarkable congregation of over 12,000 at a great open-air service."

LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE, THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IS UNDERGOING critical examination in these days. There is a feeling that the traditional seminary course does not altogether succeed in turning out preachers for the times, at least in many instances. Many theologues enter upon their actual work with an academic overload while out of touch, if not out of sympathy, with the burdened humanity they are supposed to help and guide in things of the spirit.

To the credit of the ministry be it said that preachers themselves are sharing, if not leading, in this investigation of ministerial training. Recently Dr. Justin Wroe Nixon of the Brick

Presbyterian Church in Rochester has contributed to the discussion of this subject through the pages of *Christian Work*. That he had previously occupied a chair in a theological seminary in no way unfitted him for handling the question. In speaking of that educational theory which would build a seminary course about the content of Christianity, he describes the chasm the young preacher soon discovers between his education and the reality of life in the pastorate, and then proceeds:

"The first conspicuous weakness lies in the fact that theological education on the traditional principle does not prepare men for thinking in terms of the concrete, the method that dominates effective preaching. The mind of the student is crammed with the content of Christian history and literature. Experiences of the most divergent character developed in a vast variety of circumstances have to be organized into some semblance of continuity. The favorite device of the scientific mind for securing this sense of continuity is an abstraction. Successful scientific investigation always comes to rest in an abstraction of some sort, e. g., the formulas of Newton and Einstein; the correlation of drunkenness with poverty and crime; of the incidence rate of feeble-mindedness in a selected group of families with the Mendelian ratio. When scientific method is applied in the field of religion, accordingly, it must leave out the unique and the individual in the experience of a prophet, for instance, and catalog him if possible as an example of some principle. These abstractions are organized into a coherent system of thought which we call theology. Preachers then take these principles of theology and deck them out for sermon purposes with concrete illustrations hung as upon a clotheshorse.

"But such a philosophic religion is never popularly effective. It is always more or less esoteric. The method of vital religion is vastly different. It starts with the concrete, with its warmth of human appeal (Christ, the Virgin, the saints, the Bible, the ceremonies of worship, the social ambitions of the group), and from these concrete experiences it works back in the minds of rationalizers toward general principles. Religion has to maintain at all costs warmth, color, vitality, moving and converting power, contact with men. The rationalizers of religion have not, as a rule, been good evangelists and missionaries. Their thinking has been valuable in conserving the gains

already secured by others. But the fighting front of a religious movement is always composed of those whose lives are motivated by vivid concrete experiences.

"Is this all exaggeration and caricature? Then listen to the words of Lafcadio Hearn, both literary artist and teacher, as to the effect of current types of so-called courses in 'literature' on the development of literary gifts:

"The faculty of artistic seeing is independent of education and must be cultivated outside of education. Education has not made great writers. On the contrary they have become great in spite of education. For the effect of education is necessarily to deaden and dull those primitive and instinctive feelings upon which the higher phases of emotional art depend. Knowledge can only be gained in most cases at the expense of certain very precious natural faculties.'"

THE EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE METHODS OF PREPARATION FOR the Christian ministry may be expected to produce suggested remedies that are striking, to say the least. In the *Survey Graphic* lately, Dr. Richard C. Cabot, a physician of Cambridge, Massachusetts, makes a plea for "a clinical year as a part of theological study." He has, with Dr. Alfred Worcester, upon invitation presented his ideas on the subject to some of the students of the Episcopal Seminary in Cambridge and of Union Seminary in New York. His views as to the practical side of ministerial training may be gathered from these extracts:

"We believe that the gospel of Christ and the spirit by which Christ lived is what is most needed in every one of the problems which we talked over with the students. We believe that the spirit of Christianity and the power of Christianity—(and not of a vague theism or a stoical ethics)—is the solution for the social problems which every minister's parish contains. We are quite prepared to say that the Christian minister shall preach nothing but 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified'—no sociology, no psychoanalysis, no secular economics or hygiene. The 'socialization of the gospel' has often meant the abandonment of the gospel in a mush of modern materialism and sentimentalism. The minister's job as we see it (I am speaking still of Dr. Alfred Worcester and myself) is not the same as the doctor's

or the social worker's or the psychologist's. When we urge a theological student to get 'clinical experience' outside his lecture rooms and his chapel, to visit the sick, the insane, the prisons and the almshouses, it is not because we want him to get away from his theology but because we want him to practise his theology where it is most needed, i. e., in personal contact with individuals in trouble.

"Our lectures and discussions were little more than a whet and a challenge. We wanted to show the intense religious interests of these personal problems and the crying need of practice in meeting them. In short we wanted to urge upon them the need of a *clinical year as a part of theological study.*"

"Theological teaching, Biblical study, systematic theology (that king of all studies!), the construction of sermons and the conduct of worship, would, I believe, find refreshment and invigoration if, between these exercises, the teachers and pupils had been on the firing line together, had suffered and rejoiced together, shared success and failure, been inspired sometimes by the nobility of human nature seen under stress of misfortune or temptation, been disgusted sometimes by the horrors of human nature at its worst and by their own ineptitude and helplessness in the attempt to set up better standards. I believe that young ministers so taught, given such a taste for the need of Christ's gospel and the power of that gospel in suffering and loneliness, would not stop with their 'clinical year' but would continue their 'clinical work' both in the families and in the institutions of their parishes. Such ministers would also, I believe, become far better preachers; and for this reason, as well as for their greater experience and helpfulness in the great common problems of human personality and human association, they would be more prized, sought after and rewarded both by their congregations and by the public at large."

WHAT DO THE PRAYERS BY THE PREACHER IN PUBLIC WORSHIP amount to? Are they merely formal items in the service, like reciting the creed, or does such a prayer have a distinct value, a place of its own, a power that the hearers cannot escape? How many preachers prepare themselves to exercise this function of their ministry as they do to preach the sermon? Yet nothing in the whole church service should bring the people closer to God, give them more of the sense of the divine

presence than this. In *The Directory for Worship*, of the Presbyterian Church, this specific injunction is laid upon ministers:

“We think it necessary to observe that, although we do not approve, as is well known, of confining ministers to set or fixed forms of prayer for public worship, yet it is the indispensable duty of every minister, previously to his entering on his office, to prepare and qualify himself for this part of his duty as well as for preaching. He ought, by a thorough acquaintance with the holy Scriptures, by reading the best writers on the subject, by meditation and by a life of communion with God in secret, to acquire both the spirit and the gift of prayer. Not only so, but when he is to enter on particular acts of worship, he should endeavor to compose his spirit, and to digest his thoughts for prayer, that it may be performed with dignity and propriety, as well as to the profit of those who join in it, and that he may not disgrace that important service by mean, irregular or extravagant effusions.”

A YOUNG MAN HEARD A LECTURE ONE EVENING BY A FAMOUS speaker of the spellbinder type. He was carried away with it, and next day was enthusiastically praising the performance in superlative terms. “Well, what did he say?” some one asked. After a moment of floundering the admiring hearer had to admit that he could not say just what the lecturer was getting at.

This is not an unusual experience. Some men with good presence and voice and fine diction, all serving a flow of fervid feeling, simply sweep their hearers along on a sort of oratorical freshet which soon subsides and leaves them stranded in shallow and muddy vagaries. Another bad fault lies in carrying on pulpit or platform small talk—inconsequential ideas put out in a kind of exquisite style. On this latter type W. Russell Maltby of the British Wesleyan Church is quoted as making this comment:

“Be very careful to avoid formless preaching, which hypnotizes the congregation into oblivion. There was a time when the preacher was a very great person, who put great tidings into long, rolling polysyllables. Dr. Watkinson was—indeed, he told me so himself—a pioneer in the more conversational, freer, and easier style, but it was never formless. One fault in many

sermons is that we go straight on and are afraid to stop and give people a chance to take a breath and say, 'That's that.' No congregation can listen steadily for more than about five minutes unless there is some break or pause. Try to capture the music of the English language. Discover the note of beauty in your own voice. See that every word has its head and tail, and the body will take care of itself. Never let an abstract noun out without a concrete noun in attendance to watch it. Beware of nice religious patter. Get good stuff in your mind, and it will come out in its own time and do its own work. Where six words will do, never use sixteen. Because people seem poor and ignorant, don't give them milk and water. They want your very best."

NUMBERS ARE INSPIRING, BUT OFTEN DECEPTIVE. THE BIGGEST college does not always produce the best trained graduates. Big towns, big business organizations, big circulation of periodicals, big clubs, big churches, big Sunday Schools—these get the popular write-ups and the public applause. On the other side, the people of the small enterprises are made to feel their smallness, and to suspect that they have a very doubtful right to encumber the ground.

Take for example the small Sunday School. It is the simple truth that all of the famous big Sunday Schools of the country might disband on a given day, and yet the great Sunday School work of America would go on without any perceptible difference.

A New York State Sunday School worker, Dr. Joseph Clark, has brought out from the treasury of a rich experience these valuable facts about the place of the small school:

"The statistical report of the last International Sunday School Convention (1922) reveals that in the United States there are 144,450 Sunday Schools. The great majority of them are little schools, located in the open country or in small villages of 1,500 or less—generally less. The large schools are in the cities. Compared to the total number of schools in America, they are few. They are in the spot-light more than are the little schools. The large school is given more space in the Sunday School magazines and the public press. Its spectacular pro-

grams and achievements are given greater publicity than is the work of the little school; but the total membership of the large schools, when compared to the total Sunday School membership of America, is so insignificant that, were all large schools blotted out, the Sunday School membership of our country would not be alarmingly reduced.

"Many will be surprised to learn that the average Sunday School enrollment in America is less than 60. That means that where there are scores of Sunday Schools numbering more than 1,000, and hundreds from 200 to 500, there are multiplied thousands with an enrollment of from 10 to 20 and from 40 to 50. These constitute the rank and file of the Sunday School army, and it is to these schools the nation must chiefly look for the Christian citizenship of the future. The strategic importance of the small Sunday School is chiefly revealed in the fact that in it is enrolled two-thirds of America's seventeen million Sunday School scholars. The little school has in it the strategic importance of numbers.

"The second feature of the little school which contributes to its strategic importance is its opportunity for more intensive work. In a sense, it shares with the small college the privilege of more direct contact with the pupil. The environment of the school is more conducive to reflection. The life of the community is less strenuous. There are not so many things to distract the attention and thought of the pupil after an impression has been made. There is a closer community contact between teacher and pupil. The pupil's daily life, as well as his home environment, is more of an open book. The teacher thus knows better how to apply the truth to the needs of the pupil. Teachers must know not only the lesson, but also the pupil, if the lesson is to be taught under the most ideal conditions, and in the small school these essential conditions are best realized.

"The third strategic opportunity lies in the fact that small rural schools win to Christ, and train for service, thousands of workers who later move to the cities, carry their religion with them, and in time are chosen pillars in the church. They become elders, or deacons, or church trustees, or Sunday School superintendents, or teachers in the large city churches and schools.

"During thirty years of contact with churches of all denominations, in cities with a population of from 100,000 to 1,000,000, I have frequently asked official boards how many of its members were country or village born, were given early religious training in a country Sunday School, were converted

in childhood or youth through the influence of the Sunday School, and united with a country or a village church. Between sixty and seventy per cent. reported that they were trained in the small rural Sunday School and became Christians through the influence of a rural church or school. When they moved to the city, they took with them their country brand of religion and zeal, and found in the city churches and schools opportunity for service. So uniformly alike have such tests proven, that long ago I reached the conclusion that the city or large village church and school would be sadly crippled if the small rural schools failed steadily to supply material for workers. These country or village trained recruits are the leaven that leavens the whole lump."

THE RURAL CHURCH IS A DECISIVE FACTOR IN THE FUTURE OF the farming regions of this country, as well as an influence by no means negligible in the character of our cities. It is not enough that this or that communion independently undertakes to do something to better the situation; it is a question to be faced by the whole Protestant church of America acting with intelligent co-operation. If more vigorous, fruitful, and persistent effort is not soon forthcoming in this field, one may be tempted to hope for the rise of some strong evangelical movement or body devoted exclusively to the preaching and practice of the Gospel in the country, distinguished by the field of its labors rather than by doctrine or polity, and drawing its workers from consecrated Christian men and women everywhere.

Dr. J. C. Galpin of the Department of Agriculture not long ago, in an address before the international association of agricultural missions in annual session in New York, gave a suggestive, though too severe, diagnosis of the situation as it now obtains when he said:

"If the American farmer slowly sinks into peasantry, through national unconcern; if the rural church sinks and goes down with him; it will be due, in my estimation, to the sickness of the American church; it will be a case of national decline due to the temporary eclipse of religion. It will not be at base a case of bad economics or bad politics. The aristocratic superiorities of a dozen righteous cults,—all so near alike that God him-

self is not supposed to tell them apart—will have brought on the doom.

“Religion is the only lantern I know in this twilight world. It may be sometimes a smoky lantern. It may be hidden under the jacket of some very ordinary person. I shall not live to see the new day for the rural church; but that new day will come. I do not believe the American farmer will sink into peasantry. I believe a prophet will arise, who, warming all hearts and bringing to the point of ignition the dormant love of men for men, for just plain men, will build upon the facts of this generation and upon the insight of this intellectual era; and the rural church will rise to distinction. I do not expect to see with my own eyes your sects and mine—all very haughty cults indeed—joining their resources under a single battle cry against the devil; but I do not doubt for a single instant that it will one day come. Otherwise the devil wins.”

THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE IS JUST BEGINNING TO WAKE UP TO the extent and vital importance of its rural problem. The country church furnishes only one phase of the question. There is the country school, the social welfare of the country, the health problem, involving the dwindling number of physicians in rural America, then the farm with all its difficulties. There is need for an actual crusade of organization and work to meet the needs of this large and essential element of our population. The Protestant church is making a start, but needs to devote more men and money to the situation. Now the Catholic Church is showing an interest in the matter, as this summary in the Record of Christian Work evidences:

“Through its National Catholic Rural Life Conference the Roman Catholic church announces a purpose to enter rural life of America to an extent it has never yet done. The conference states that out of more than 20,000 Roman Catholic priests in service, fewer than 2000 are in rural parishes or missions. Instead, they are in the large cities, and in many cases they are in down-town districts of those cities, with often many priests attached to the same parish.

“At a recent meeting of priests of the Roman Catholic church, assigned to solve some of the rural tasks, dioceses in fifteen states were represented. Some laymen were added to a

new board of control, and plans were made both to establish some new seminaries and to install instructors in old ones, especially for the training of priests for rural service.

"States wherein the conference says there is great lack of Roman Catholic churches include Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Texas, Indiana, Alabama and Illinois. An official of the conference has been detached to visit Europe, and there learn if possible how the rural problem has been solved. Returning, this official is to give a course on rural work at Notre Dame University. The conference says it is convinced that the numerical weakness of the Roman Catholic church in the Southern states can be overcome if rural work is properly studied and then promoted in those states."

THE DISCONTENT AMONG THE FARMING POPULATION IS BECOMING so acute that probably more attention is being given to this class of our people than ever by political economists and by students of the whole broad social question.

On the one hand, the comparative poverty of a large portion of the country dwellers is making them seek every opportunity to locate in the large centers, and, on the other, it is pointed out that if a farmer becomes possessed of enough money to make life in the country comfortable, even luxurious, he is the first to want to move to the city where his means will open the door to more elaborate enjoyment of life. So opposite economic conditions have the effect of increasing rural discontent. One explanation of the state of affairs is, that the auto, the moving picture, the radio, and things of this sort are infecting the farming people with the same love of pleasure and excitement that has brought on the "jazz age" in the city. The toil and deprivations of their occupation make life by contrast seem too barren for contentment.

The lack of a just return for their labor is doubtless the chief economic source of the farmer's complaint, and the marketing problem is the center of various schemes and experiments. Not long ago the Survey Graphic had an editorial on this point which illustrates the part that government seems compelled to play in our modern complex life:

"Apparently, agriculture can no longer be regarded as a self-supporting industry. If its legislative pills and economic crutches were removed, it would need to apply for admission in the *laissez-faire* home for indigents.

"The seat of local infection is presumed to be somewhere in the neighborhood of the marketing system. In some mysterious manner the good old law of supply and demand fails to stabilize agricultural prices. There must be a villain in the economic woodpile. There is. He sows not, neither does he spin but he gets the profit all the same. His name is middleman. The plot is simple enough; all that is needed is a hero or a magic word with which to exorcise this evil spirit. And, the word has come—a fine-sounding, sonorous word with plenty of moral and social implications—*cooperation*. Cooperative commodity marketing associations: this is the modern symbol, the shield under which the farmer goes forth to do battle with economic devils. But how make the symbol work?

"Answer: Make it legal. Thus more than thirty of the so-called united states passed cooperative marketing laws which enabled associations to prosecute their disloyal members. But it remained for Australian farmers of Queensland to carry the legalistic formula to its logical limits. In 1922 the legislature passed a law which specifies that, if the majority of producers of a given commodity desire to concentrate the marketing of the product through a cooperative association, the minority shall become members of the organization and help finance and support it. Compulsory cooperation has been carried on under the provisions of this act during the past two years, and apparently with success. Thus far the experiment has been limited to the marketing of eggs, cheese, arrow-root, butter, pigs, maize, peanuts and canary seed. The state government has borne the total cost of the organization during the first two years and will continue to bear one-half the cost for the next two and one-half years. Compulsory cooperation—amazing paradox! Evidently, Australians mean to have a cooperative commonwealth (they also enjoy compulsory voting) whether they like it or not. And they seem to like it."

WEALTH MEANS PLEASURE TO THE LOVER OF THE MATERIAL things of this life; it means opportunity for the ambitious; but it means responsibility for the godly. Isn't it about time we stop exulting over our national wealth, and begin to reckon

the meaning of it in its good and bad possibilities? What is our prosperity doing to the younger generation of a nation that owns so many automobiles that the entire population could ride at one time?

What are some of the things that ought to be done with our wealth? Why are the church boards of various kinds at their wits' ends for money to keep going? Why are religious periodicals so hard pressed for means to continue publication? Why are the finance committees of interdenominational institutions, hospitals, homes, and charitable organizations of all kinds driven to so many schemes to secure funds? Why is all this, in the presence of the fact that most of America's wealth is in the hands of people who are members of our churches?

At the close of last year the Manufacturers' Record gave this summary, which ought to read like a warning to every professing Christian who is comfortable as respects this world's goods, but who is not "rich toward God":

"American has between 6 and 7 per cent of the world's population, but we have 85 per cent of the world's automobiles, or more than 17,000,000. We are spending annually \$10,000,000,000 upon the purchase and maintenance of automobiles and motortrucks.

"Consider for a moment some of the statistics which show what this nation, with 6 per cent of the world land area and only 6 or 7 per cent of the world's population, is doing in comparison with the combined output in many lines of industry of the rest of the world. Today this country is producing:

- 55 per cent of the world's iron ore;
- 51 per cent of the world's pig iron;
- 66 per cent of the world's steel;
- 51 per cent of the world's copper;
- 62 per cent of the world's petroleum;
- 43 per cent of the world's coal;
- 52 per cent of the world's timber output;
- 65 per cent of the world's naval stores;
- 42 per cent of the world's phosphate;
- 80 per cent of the world's sulphur;
- 63 per cent of the world's mica;
- 62 per cent of the world's lead;

- 64 per cent of the world's zinc;
- 60 per cent of the world's talc and soapstone;
- 45 per cent of the world's barytes;
- 55 per cent of the world's cotton.

"In 1904 the estimated wealth of this country was \$107,000,000,000. In 1922 it was nearly \$321,000,000,000. The stock of money in the United States rose from \$2,803,000,000 in 1904 to \$8,746,000,000 in 1924.

"In 1904 the total value of our manufactured products was \$14,793,000,000. In 1923 it was \$60,555,000,000, or more than four times as great as it had been 20 years before.

"The value of food and kindred products rose from \$2,845,000,000 to \$9,529,000,000, while the output of textile goods was considerably more than four times as great in 1924 as in 1904, having risen in that period from \$2,144,000,000 to \$9,478,000,000.

"In 1904 the value of the mineral products of the country was \$1,362,000,000. In 1924 it was \$6,000,000,000."

WHEN ONE HAS READ HIS MORNING PAPER, WITH ITS TALES OF crime and its testimony to the disregard for morals, law, and common decency, he is apt to smile at any reference to this as a Christian country. The ideals back of the founding and progress of America, however, have been the product of Christianity. Freedom of conscience, liberty in the pursuit of all right ambition, equal rights, protection of the weak and unfortunate, education for the masses, regard for womanhood, are not the fruit of paganism or irreligion.

But the present state of the public conscience, the indifference to everything that threatens the home, the reluctance to punish the convicted criminal properly and promptly, and various other marks of the times make us ask whether America is not now running on a diminishing moral momentum that will soon be exhausted altogether. Eternal vigilance is the price of other things besides liberty. In the colonial days this country drew largely from the best religious and moral resources of Europe, but in these latter days the reverse seems largely the rule. The editor of The National Methodist Press has drawn this sketch of the change that has come over our population, a

comparison that ought to make every Christian American, in city or country, think and pray and work for the spiritual and moral awakening of the land:

"The Protestant Church through the years furnished the inspiration, the ideals and the leadership which developed those institutions which are regarded as typically American. Washington regarded the place of the Church as of first importance in founding this government. He insisted upon a chaplain for every regiment of his army and was inducted into the presidency with a church service. Those who wrought our national ideals into a constitution sought the aid of prayer, and with their compatriots in the First Congress placed in the Constitution as its initial amendment a fundamental prohibition—'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This indicates the broadening religious spirit of the early colonists. They crossed the seas to escape the oppression which the Roman Church system had spread over Europe. At first they would tolerate in their colonies no advocate of that system, and at the time the First Congress met, there were not, outside the Protestant Church, any religionists in sufficiently large numbers to require a change of attitude.

"Between the days of the First Congress and those of the present Congress, the constituency of the United States has markedly changed. In the early day Washington spoke of the population as one in race and religion and therefore readily coalescing. Such was evident in the First Congress, but the last thirty years has witnessed a great change. Today we look upon a Congress which is a commingling of various races, and all too often there are found advocates of racial ideals contrary to the interests of this country.

"We enter the year 1926 with over 7,000,000 persons residing here who have never declared their allegiance to the Stars and Stripes. This is nearly twice the whole population of 1790. The foreign born or of foreign-born parentage in this country are nearly ten times the population of this country when the First Congress assembled. Many of these are now among our truest and finest citizens, unexcelled in their patriotism and Americanism. But during the coming of these millions, many countries, which made practically no contribution to our colonial population, poured multitudes through our gates. Some countries sent along with others, who have become substantial

citizens, their criminal classes. The contributions of some countries were largely illiterate. At last the Congress of the United States awakened to the fact that there was a large element in our national life which held ideals entirely at variance with those regarded as essentially American. They realized that in the United States was a great mass which had not become assimilated, either because recent immigrants came in too great volume or were largely unassimilable. Whatever the cause, the only immediate safeguard was a check of the immigration tides."

THE INTEREST BEING TAKEN IN ARCHEOLOGY IS AMAZING. THE papers are continually giving accounts of new expeditions and the discoveries of others in various fields. Beyond doubt much may be added to our Biblical and classical knowledge in the course of even a very few years.

To the Bible student particular interest attaches to a new enterprise of this kind, just beginning its work at the site of Shechem. Bishop H. M. Du Bose of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, a valued contributor to these pages, is an enthusiastic member and a leading spirit of this expedition. In the course of an address delivered before the present year opened he revealed the prospects at Shechem in these words:

"My present message to my fellow Bible students and fellow Bible lovers in America concerns the coming excavations, to be made at the site of the Shechem of the Bible. Shechem is the most important city of Bible history. There Abraham and Jacob lived; there Joshua had a foregathering of the people of Israel after the conquest and there he set up an inscribed memorial stone. There Jacob buried valuable images and records; there Jeroboam the First had his capital and there built a palace; but above all, it was there that the bones of Joseph were translaidd by the victorious tribe. The ruins of Shechem contain records and witnesses of metal, bronze, pottery and tablets which, it is believed, will establish beyond doubt the historicity of Abraham and Jacob, the history of the conquest and the truth of the story of the days of the Judges."

IN THE NATURE OF THE CASE THE PROHIBITION LAW ENCOUNTERS many obstacles to its enforcement, and its enemies, high and low, make the most of this. Little by little it is becoming clear

that, despite numerous infractions of the law and the great outcry made over them by the press and by "investigators" here and there, prohibition of the liquor traffic in its general results is a distinct blessing. Mr. Ernest W. Mandeville has contributed to *The Outlook* a series of articles covering, first, the favorable and unfavorable sides of the working of the American law, and then the state of things in Great Britain respecting liquor, and he makes this comparison between the two countries:

"The balance seems to me to weigh heavily in favor of our own system, and when one thinks of the progress which will, in all probability, be made here at the end of twenty years and the likely further deterioration of the liquor-sodden thousands in England at that time, there really is no comparison. 'I would rather have England free than England sober,' declared his Grace the Roman Catholic Archbishop Magee. This sentiment was recently echoed and supported by the Anglican Lord Bishop of Durham. After a close study of the bootlegging evils in the United States and then a tour of observation through Great Britain, I feel strongly that I would rather see America under prohibition than America sodden with drink, as in England. With all the hypocrisy, deceit, and corruption that is fostered by our feeble enforcement of the Volstead Act, a large portion of our citizens are at least making an effort to improve the condition of society, and there is reason to think that in the long run they will be successful. In England a firmly intrenched liquor trade, supported by both temporal and spiritual peers, is saddling the populace, many of whom are poverty-stricken through the serious post-war unemployment situation, with a national drink bill of approximately \$1,770,000,000."

BOOKS

JESUS OF NAZARETH ¹

THIS is the book which, in recent days, created a great stir in the Jewish communities of America when Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, accepting the author's views about Jesus of Nazareth, gave them public utterance in one of his sermons at the Free Synagogue. After being severely criticized by the "Agudath Harabonim" and by many of his colleagues he was compelled even to resign, for a time, from his position at the head of one of the Zionist organizations. At the same time other rabbis all over the country have come to the defense of Rabbi Wise, one of them, Rabbi Lewis Browne of Newark, New Jersey, going so far as to declare that "the views expressed by Rabbi Wise on this subject are accepted in all the modern Jewish theological seminaries" (reported in The New York Times).

It is, therefore, very important for Christians to know what these modern Jewish views of Jesus of Nazareth exactly are, and the volume under review, which has been translated from a Hebrew original by Herbert Danby, D.D., Canon Residentiary of St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem, explains everything about them.

As to the author himself, the Introduction states that Joseph Klausner, Ph.D., Heidelberg, is a leading Zionist and a well known Hebrew writer and historian. He is a specialist in the investigation of the rabbinical sources of the New Testament period and is the author of several important publications on this subject, written chiefly in the German language. So he now enjoys a high and well-earned reputation "as writer, historian and leader of thought in those Jewish circles which are working in the cause of the present Hebrew cultural revival, commonly called Zionism." For his degree of doctor of philoso-

¹ Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching. By Joseph Klausner, Ph.D. Translated by Herbert Danby, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 434.

phy in Heidelberg he wrote the thesis, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten* (Jewish Messianic Ideas in the Tannaitic Period), a subject upon which he has ever since persistently worked and which compelled him to devote attention, closer and more minute than had ever yet been given by any Jewish scholar, to the subject of Jesus, His Messianic claims, and the subject of Christian origins to which the present volume is entirely devoted. As the translator points out, "this is the first time such a work has been attempted in Hebrew with neither satiric nor apologetic bias." This Jewish nationalist historian, resident at last in Palestine, "assured of the safety of his national life, while seeking to display the national and cultural achievements of his people," tries to include in his gallery the person and life of Jesus of Nazareth. To this end Dr. Klausner has thought it a duty to the Jews "to place this life before them, and to throw such light upon it as he was able by means of his own learning and researches in contemporary Jewish history and literature, and his knowledge of the critical work done by his predecessors, Jews and non-Jews."

In accomplishing this task for his Jewish readers he has done a great service to the Christians by demonstrating the absolute historicity and the real existence of Jesus of Nazareth, by means of documents entirely Jewish. There is set out a full range of what modern Jewish scholarship has to offer on the subject of the Jewish background of the Gospels. The rabbinical sources are a most formidable subject of study and quite beyond the capacity of all but the smallest handful of non-Jewish students. The present work now presents all this material in a handy, accessible form, and as the translator observes, "this fact alone seemed to justify its translation into English."

But besides this, the Christian reader gets an inside view into the mental processes of a modern Pharisee who, notwithstanding all the advantages of the highest education, combined with a keen intellect, remains a narrow-minded traditionalist, as much as were his predecessors who were contemporary with

Jesus of Nazareth. To a mind of this type the greatness of the figure of the Nazarene assumes the proportions and the size of one of the Jewish "*chakamim*," so that, so reduced, it may easily take its place in that gallery of the "*Tannaim*" and "*Amoraim*," which is the Talmud, "that wonderful monument of human industry, human wisdom and human folly" as Milman has justly described it.

This unconscious demonstration of the workings of the mind of a Talmudically trained theologian, even when he tries his best to be fair and impartial, will be quite a revelation to the Gentile readers and will explain why the Pharisees of Jesus' time were so little impressed by His character, by His words, and by His miracles.

This work is divided into eight books. The first deals with The Sources, and the author considers them in this order: a. The Hebrew sources, b. the Greek and Latin sources, c. the Epistles of Paul, d. the early Fathers of the Church, e. The Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Gospels, and f. the Canonical Gospels.

His discussion of the Hebrew sources, as it was to be expected, is most interesting, especially in its conclusions. In fact, the author in the course of his investigation is compelled to make this declaration, which ought to set rationalistic "Christians" to thinking seriously:

"It therefore follows that the accounts in the first three Gospels are fairly early, and that it is unreasonable to question either the existence of Jesus (as certain scholars have done both in the eighteenth century and in our own time) or his general character as it is depicted in these Gospels. This is the single historical value which we can attribute to the early *Talmudical* accounts of Jesus." (P. 20.)

In his discussion of the Greek and Latin sources it is very interesting to notice his conclusions about the two famous Jesus passages in the Antiquities of Josephus. About the first he says: "The present writer believes, however, that there are not sufficient grounds for supposing the *whole* to be spurious" (p.

57). "We must treat as interpolated only the italicized passages" (p. 58). The passage in question, therefore, is proved to be genuine in everything except the italicized words, and remains as follows: "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, *if it be lawful to call him a man*. For he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. *He was the Messiah*; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first ceased not so to do, *for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine Prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him*; and the race of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct even now." (*Antiqq.* XVIII, iii, 3.)

As to the second passage of Josephus (*Antiqq.* XX, ix, 1), the author after careful and profound consideration is compelled "to consider it wholly genuine." He defends its genuineness by destroying the arguments of "Christian" rationalists and concludes thus:

"None could write in such a fashion but a Pharisaic *Jew* like Josephus, who had previously referred to Jesus and did not wish to say much either in praise or blame of the Christians," etc. (p. 59 f.).

Coming to the Latin sources, Dr. Klausner takes up first the testimony of Suetonius, which he thinks more important even than that of Tacitus, "Judaeos, impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit" (Claudius 25), and argues thus:

"Even if we suppose with Graetz that Suetonius here refers to a Christian teacher, the fact that, only twenty years after the death of Jesus, there were to be found Christian apostles and teachers, is itself proof not only of his existence but also of the important effect of his personal influence. Others, again, think that 'Chrestus' only points to some Jewish Messiah who rose up in Rome; but Bousset rightly points out that the 'appearance of a messianic revolutionary in Rome is not only inconceivable in itself, but is unproved by any other source.'

"It therefore follows that a Christian community was founded in Rome during the fifth decade of the first century, *i. e.* not later than ten years after the crucifixion. This is an important fact from every point of view." (P. 61.)

Summing up the results of his investigations of Greek and Latin sources, Jewish or pagan, the author concludes thus:

"If we possessed them alone, we should know nothing except that in Judaea there had existed a Jew named Jesus who was called the Christ, the 'Anointed;' that he performed miracles and taught the people; that he was killed by Pontius Pilate at the instigation of the Jews; that he had a brother named James, who was put to death by the High Priest Annas, the son of Annas; that owing to Jesus there arose a special sect known as Christians; that a community belonging to this sect existed in Rome fifty years after the birth of Jesus, and that because of this community the Jews were expelled from Rome; and, finally, that from the time of Nero the sect greatly increased, regarded Jesus as virtually divine, and underwent severe persecution" (p. 62).

This is considerably more than the great majority of Gentile rationalists of every kind are willing to admit, and Dr. Klausner says at the end of his study of these sources:

"All this stands out firm and irrefutable, and there is no solid foundation for the doubts raised by Bruno Bauer and more recently by Albert Kalthoff and Arthur Drews (*cf.* the following section). During the time (fifty years or less) which elapsed between the death of Jesus (at the date approximately recorded by the Canonical Gospels) and the age of Josephus and R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, or between Paul and Tacitus, it was quite impossible for a purely fabricated presentment of the figure of Jesus so firmly to have gripped people's imagination, that historians like Josephus and Tacitus, and men like R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (who was so cautious in transmitting what he had heard from his teachers), should believe in his existence and all refer to him as one who had lived and worked quite recently and had made for himself friends and disciples; or that Paul should have had such a complete belief in him and never doubt that James was the brother, and Peter and his fellows, disciples of Jesus. That much is clear; and those who would utterly deny not simply the form which Jesus now as-

sumes in the world or that which he assumes according to the Gospels, but even his very existence and the great positive, or negative, importance of his personality—such men simply deny all historic reality.

“Joseph Salvador speaks of the same problem, a problem raised (very many years before Bauer) as early as the eighteenth century; and in answer to sceptics, he quotes these words of Rousseau: ‘In reality this (the denial of Jesus’ existence) is only shirking the difficulty (raised by the dissimilarities in the Gospels) and not getting rid of it. It is far more incomprehensible that many men should have agreed to compose this book than that one man alone should have provided it with its subject matter. . . . So impossible of imitation are the characteristics of the Gospels that the man who invented them must needs be greater than his hero’ (Emile, ‘Profession de foi’).

“This may be taken also as an adequate rejoinder to the conglomeration of pseudo-scientific proofs advanced by Bruno Bauer, Kalthoff, and Drews!” (P. 70.)

Having thus conclusively demonstrated the historicity of the figure of Jesus, Dr. Klausner then sets to work to reduce it to the proportions of one of the Jewish sages, such as the Talmud quotes in considerable numbers. This he does, in general, by misunderstanding and misinterpreting passages from the Gospels so as to bring out supposed faults and contradictions in the character and teachings of Jesus. A few illustrations will be sufficient to show his peculiar method. Commenting on the sending forth of the twelve Apostles he says:

“Matthew further adds to Jesus’ words, that ‘since they were as sheep among wolves’ they must be ‘both subtle as serpents and simple as doves.’ Here we have a trait in Jesus’ character that should not be ignored: we shall see later, and more than once, that Jesus was by no means the tender, placable, unworldly character which his apologists, even among the ‘Liberal’ Christians, describe.” (P. 286.)

A little further on, always commenting on the same subject, Dr. Klausner expresses himself as follows:

“So, two by two, the Apostles preached repentance throughout the neighboring small towns and villages. They were successful and overjoyed to find that they, too, could ‘expel

spirits,' *i. e.*, that they, too, could exercise suggestion in nervous cases; and the Talmudic literature informs us, that at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, one Jacob of Kefar-Sekanya (or Kefar Sama) wished to heal of snake-bite Ben Dama, nephew of the *Tanna* R. Ishmael, 'by the name of Jesus.' But the Apostles cured also by natural means: 'they anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them,' as the Evangelist simply puts it." (P. 286.)

At the beginning of the fifth book Dr. Klausner says:

"The strong expressions used by Jesus against the Pharisees show him again as very different from the 'tender' and 'placable' person depicted by Christians ('The Lamb of God;' 'as a sheep before her shearers is dumb'). He was a combatant preacher and spoke as harshly to the Pharisees as ever Jeremiah did to the priests. In his preaching he was thus akin to the Prophets, while in his parables he was more akin to the *Haggadist* Pharisees." (P. 293.)

A little later, commenting on the "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!" he says:

"Such bitterness shows clearly that his condition was becoming worse; he saw no progress in his work: he is indignant and curses. Such words . . . show not the least trace of that peculiar 'tenderness' and 'unconditional forgiveness.' Jesus was a Jew, . . . he is by no means that type which the Christians have depicted for themselves—one who forgives all, who, when offended, offends not again." (P. 295.)

The episode of the Canaanitish woman (Mark 7:27) is eagerly seized upon by Dr. Klausner who declares that Jesus' answer to her "was so brusque and chauvinistic that if any other Jewish teacher of the time had said such a thing Christians would never have forgiven Judaism for it" (p. 294).

But this fervent heat of Dr. Klausner cannot but produce a good deal of amusement in all those who are familiar with the numerous expressions which the "Jewish sages" who have written the Talmud, and who are the object of Dr. Klausner's admiration, have used not only against foreigners, but even against those of their own people who have the misfortune of

not being "learned" and "wise," as they think themselves. For instance, in the Talmud, in the treatise *Pesachim* (fol. 49, col. 2), we read as follows:

"Rabbi Eleazar says: 'It is lawful to split open the nostrils of an "am-haaretz" [*i. e.*, an unlearned man] on the Day of Atonement which falls on the Sabbath.'" This is quite different from the utterance of mere threats and utterly at variance with the character of Him "whose mercies are over all his works," the unlearned and the poor, as well as the mighty and the learned! Indeed, the passage is so monstrous, that one is almost inclined to think that it must have crept into the Talmud by mistake or, at the least, to expect that it would be followed by reprehension the most explicit and severe. But no, a little further on, another of these "wise Rabbis" says: "It is lawful to rend an 'am-haaretz' like a fish." And a little above, in the same treatise, a "disciple of the wise" is forbidden to marry the daughter of one unlearned, for that she is no better than a beast! But the whole passage is so characteristic of the spirit of Talmudic rabbinism that it is worth inserting: "Our Rabbis have taught: Let a man sell all he has and marry the daughter of a learned man. If he cannot find the daughter of a learned man, let him take the daughter of a great man of the time. If he cannot find the daughter of a great man of the time, let him marry the daughter of the head of a congregation. If he cannot find the daughter of the head of a congregation, let him marry the daughter of an almoner. . . . But let him not marry the daughter of the unlearned, for they are an abomination, and their wives are vermin; and of their daughters it is said: Cursed is he that lieth with any beast." This passage is also transcribed into the digest of Jewish law called the *Shulchan Aruch*, part 2, by which transcription it is stamped with all the authority of an official law!

A learned Talmudist such as Dr. Klausner knows perfectly all the terrible, and withal ridiculous, things which the rabbis have written therein, things that may only be compared with the worst teachings of the Jesuit casuists, and yet in all his

present volume he does not utter a word of reproach or condemnation. On the contrary, he tries to justify some of them, while, on the other side, he always tries to minimize the teachings and the character of Jesus, whom he represents, in one instance, as having uttered a "saying" like those of the Talmud, which pleased the great Tanna, Rabbi Eliezer, making thereupon the following observations:

"Certainly, at first sight, this exposition dealing with the hire of the harlot and the latrine does not accord with the character of Jesus' teachings as we know them from the Gospels. . . . but let us remember that Jesus, like all Israel's sages, from the Prophets to the *Amoraim*, thought nothing 'unholy' which concerned the needs of mankind. It is not only the *Talmud* which expounds Scripture in ways which, to our modern taste, are unseemly, but even Jesus, in the Gospels, speaks of human needs with a freeness unacceptable in these days." (P. 42 f.)

This quotation shows conclusively that Dr. Klausner, far from blaming the Talmud, approves all that is written, for instance in the treatise *Niddah*, which has never been translated and which has no parallel except in the so-called *Theologia Moralis* of the famous Jesuit, St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori. Indeed, the Talmudical Jew is the counterpart of the Jesuit in the religious world today. —

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

THE FOUR GOSPELS ²

SINCE the war England has produced comparatively few large books, one distinguished author remarking, in explanation of this fact: "It is no longer possible to write or at any rate to publish, big books on philosophic (or other serious) subjects."

The book now before us, of over 622 closely printed pages, is a seeming rather, than a real, exception to this rule. The secondary title of the book, or rather, the accompanying description of its scope, which says, *Treating of the Manuscript*

²The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. By Burnett Hillman Streeter, Hon. D.D. Edin., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford; Canon of Hereford. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xiv+622.

Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates, explains my meaning in the preceding sentence. The book is really three or four books in one, a careful interweaving of the several related, but really separate, sciences which converge upon these Gospel narratives. And right here one may perhaps pause to make a single general remark. It is amazing, when we stop to think of it, that four brief and simple treatises, for the most part unmarked by artistic elaboration, should be so intensely vital in the Twentieth Century as to invite and justify the expenditure upon them of all the resources of a rich and highly cultivated intelligence in the elucidation of historical details, often minute and still more often elusive in the extreme, concerning their origin and transmission. Then, in addition, remember that this book is but one of thousands of books, great and small, on the same subject. The author of this review once, in an optimistic mood, started to make a complete collection of books on the Synoptic problem. The project fell through for two reasons. One was that the would-be collector was not a millionaire; the other, that he was not, like the wandering Jew, endowed with earthly immortality.

Professor Streeter comes to this particular task as a veteran. His contribution to the Oxford Studies in The Synoptic Problem would entitle him to distinction in this field. The present book is entitled to the somewhat out-worn phrase, *magnum opus*, by which I intend to convey a qualitative, not a quantitative, idea. It is a big book in the dimensions of depth, range, and meaning. It is so much a key work that a student possessing it may dispense with a five-foot shelf of similar works, and more.

And now to the distinctive characteristics of it. The first chapter is worthy of especial mention. It is entitled The Selected Four, and is a discussion, in broad outline and yet with clear suggestiveness, of "the early circulation of the Gospels and their collection into a Canon of inspired writings" (p. xiii). This is a particularly valuable feature of the discussion because, as Dr. Streeter correctly discerns, the Synoptic prob-

tem and the Johannine question cannot be understood except in the light of the history of the canon. Another significant feature of Dr. Streeter's discussion is his new approach to the Fourth Gospel, the importance of which is not in the least diminished by his modesty (which by the way is in evidence everywhere) in setting forth his views as "tentative." His words in this connection are worth quoting:

"The problem of the Fourth Gospel must, I am convinced, be approached from two sides. The results of historical and source criticism must be supplemented and interpreted in the light of a study of the psychology of the mystic mind. This done, the question of its authorship can be profitably discussed. My conclusions in regard to this Gospel are avowedly of a tentative character, and it is as a personal impression only that I put forward Part III. of this book. I feel sure, however, that, even if the conclusions reached are in some points erroneous, the method of approach is sound." (P. xiii.)

A number of new hypotheses, interesting and valuable in themselves and more valuable as individual contributions to problems which can be solved only by the joint labors of many generations of scholars, appear in Dr. Streeter's pages—always with the suggestion that they are offered for the consideration and judgment of scholars. It seems that Dr. Streeter has heeded Cromwell's famous advice to the Parliament. He does admit the possibility that he may be mistaken. Among these suggestions the most significant are the "Proto-Luke" conception and his "Four Document Hypothesis."

It will be proper in fulfilling the true purpose of a review, which is to introduce the prospective reader to the book rather than to enlighten him as to the reviewer's ideas on the theme which the book discusses, to make a few remarks on this Proto-Luke hypothesis. It is based on the conclusion which Dr. Streeter describes as next in importance to the discovery of the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke, "that Q and Mark overlapped" (p. 201). By this is meant that, however one may identify the source of the non-Markan materials in Matthew and Luke, this source (known universally as Q) contained items

"which also appear in Mark but in a different version." In addition to this undoubted fact is another even more obvious, namely, that in a very large and important section of his work Luke departed from Mark. This material came either from Q, in which case we must greatly modify the prevailing ideas as to the contents of Q, or from another source which Streeter calls L. The Proto-Luke hypothesis is thus stated:

"Our hypothesis implies that the editor of the Gospel found Q, not in its original form, but embodied in a much larger document (Q + L), which was in fact a complete Gospel, somewhat longer than Mark. . . . This document Q + L may be styled 'Proto-Luke.'" (P. 199.)

I shall omit the fascinating argument in favor of this hypothesis, leaving that for the reader's own delectation, and will merely state the author's conclusion as to authorship:

"This suggests the view that Luke himself may have been the person who originally combined Q and L, and then, at some subsequent date, produced an enlarged edition of his earlier work by incorporating large extracts from Mark and prefixing an account of the Infancy" (p. 200).

This is interesting in itself because, while put conditionally, it rests upon a large body of evidence, notably its parallelism in "tendency" with the Third Gospel as we have it and with the Acts. It is still more interesting when looked at in another way:

"Whatever view be held as to authorship, Proto-Luke appears to be a document independent of Mark and approximately of the same date—a conclusion of considerable moment to the historian" (p. 200).

Dr. Streeter thinks, or at any rate, hopes that, "by a new use of the MS. evidence available" he has "finally disposed of the troublesome phantom of an 'Ur Marcus' (or earlier version of Mark) which has for too long haunted the minds of scholars" (p. xiii). This hope we are all delighted to echo. There are some other like tasks of exorcism to which Dr. Streeter might profitably address himself.

A word or two should be said about the general scope of the book. Part I, already mentioned, stands by itself as a sort of framework or background of the main discussion which is divided into four sections. The first, main, section is devoted to the manuscript tradition—the most novel and suggestive part of which is concerned with the origin of the Gospels as “local texts”—as over against what may be called standard texts. Five fascinating chapters are devoted to this subject. Part II consists of six chapters, one of which is devoted to Dr. Streeter’s new Proto-Luke suggestion, and another to the four-document hypothesis, the others moving along more conventional lines, although much that is novel is included. Part III, of four chapters, is given to the discussion of the Fourth Gospel. Part IV takes up separately the question of Synoptic origins which is discussed with great originality and power.

There are four valuable appendices and some extended notes. The reader of this review who knows his New Testament literature even fairly well will perceive at once that we have here a combination of textual and literary and historical criticism, brought together, not casually, but for purposes of mutual illumination in a single discussion within the limits of one book. Only by reading the book, however, can he begin to realize the wealth of scholarships, insight, judgment, and spiritual vision which are put at his disposal.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE WORLD³

It is, for me at least, a very difficult undertaking to do justice to this ponderous and erudite volume. Dr. Cadoux begins with Jesus and ends with Constantine, when the church, for its ever-unfolding harm, became, to all intents and purposes, a state

³ *The Early Church and the World: A History of the Christian Attitude to Pagan Society and the State Down to the Time of Constantinus.* By Cecil John Cadoux, M.A., D.D., (Lond.), M.A. (Oxon.), Professor of New Testament Criticism, Exegesis, and Theology, and of Christian Sociology, in the Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1925. Pp. lii+675.

church. The author avoids the glittering generalizations which not only vitiate many books by well meaning, shallow, and hurried writers, but often constitute the very bulk and essence of such, embroidered as they often are with flowery rhetoric—often tried and tested before.

Cadoux first takes up Jesus and His utterances and attitude towards Mankind and the Kingdom of God, its character, its eschatology, the authority of its followers—using the term “propaganda,” a word fearfully debased in these latter days. Further, the Laws of Reward and Punishment; the Ethical Principles of Jesus, and their application to “outsiders” and sinners; again, His Attitude to the State, to War, to the Family, and to Property.

The learned and infinitely diligent author then carries his sociological research into The Earlier Apostolic Age, where he very properly stresses the influence of the eschatology then held, or very generally held, with the deep chasm between Christians and the world. Then follows The Later Apostolic Age, 70-110, where the Johannine eschatology comes in, also the chiliastic, and other hopes of a renewed human society on earth. Part IV deals with The Period of the Earlier Apologists, 110-180. His use there is of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Apollinaris (Pliny: *Ep.* X, 26, of course), Athenagoras, as well as of everything now preserved at second hand by the exact scholarship of Eusebius, and particularly Celsus’ attack on Christianity as preserved in the critique by Origen.

Part V Dr. Cadoux calls The Period of the Great Thinkers. Here he draws on Irenaeus of Lyon (the pupil of Polycarp), Tertullian of Carthage, Hippolytus of Rome, the opponent and rival of Callistus (after whom the Catacombs on the Appian Way are named). Origen of course is treated with very great attention. “Besides these stars of the first magnitude” here are ranged Theophilus of Antioch, the pseudo-Justinian *Oratio ad Gentiles*, the Muratorian fragment of the canon (on which see Westcott), and quite especially Minucius Felix, also certain martyr acts. The sixth and last part deals with The Period of

Final Struggle and Settlement, from 250, *i. e.*, to the decree by Constantine, issued at Milan, January, 313. Here loom large Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius, Eusebius himself, and the pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions.

Vast as the treatment is, it really deals with the social aspects, not with dogma, primarily, though of course Dr. Cadoux cannot and does not conceal his own stand in many of the problems ever cast up by speculative conjecture. I refer here primarily to the canon of the New Testament. The aloofness of our author in many of his valuations and estimates, is, as it seems to me, a sediment which still exists in Britain of that *Wissenschaftlichkeit* of many German scholars whose academic and personal ambition has sought satisfaction (and fame) in shaking the foundations wherever possible, and of whose personal religion there are sometimes but faint signs, if any. In Scotland, *e. g.*, Moffatt stands for "comparative literature," and a vast range of fanciful parallels, while Sir William Ramsay differs fundamentally. I, for one, am as deeply convinced that John wrote the Gospel known to his pupils Ignatius and Polycarp as I am that Xenophon wrote the *Hellenica*, the *Anabasis*, and the *Memorabilia* of Socrates, and that the churches founded from Ephesus by Paul and John would not accept an impostor. The loftiness and spiritual majesty of St. John, or rather of the Christ in St. John, are not due to Philonian lucubrations or later idealization; they are due to the loving and deeper spirituality of the disciple closer to the Christ than any other. Nor can we hesitate to assume that the Bishop of Ephesus sought permanently to preserve that spiritual majesty, which sank deeper into his soul after Pentecost.

While I may, *Deo volente*, later on, deal with this matter and what I call the self-revelation of Christ, I cannot here resist the temptation to call attention to a parallel or suggestion of identity as to John's Gospel and John's Apocalypse. John alone, I believe, when he reaches the end of the Saviour's sufferings on the Roman cross (John 19:34) tells the incident of the legionary who pierced (ἐνυξεν) His side with a spear so that

blood and water issued from the wound. And then John, with all the studious and consistent self-effacement in his Gospel, utters that fervid note of personal attestation: "And he who saw it bore witness [John, who alone of all the disciples, stood near the cross, probably] and true is his witness-ship, in order that you too [my hearers and readers in the churches of the Roman Province of Asia] may believe. For this too happened that the Scripture may be fulfilled. A bone of him shall not be broken." (John 19:35-36. See Ex. 12:46.) And so John at the end of his narrative restates the *Agnus Dei* (1:36) of his first chapter. But he adds, as confronting the real slayers, a sentence from Zech. 12:10, "They shall see him whom they pierced." Now John, in the very initial chapter of his vision related to the Seven Churches of the province of which Ephesus was the capital: "Behold he comes amid his clouds and there will see him every eye, and those who pierced him [ἐξέκέντησαν].".

To the statements and estimates of evil features that became rife in the Christian church I cannot but submit my unqualified assent as a historical student of Christianity. (Cadoux avoids, wisely, I think, the term Catholic with which every abuse and every superstition is to be canonized, justified, varnished or glorified by a certain school.) Even before Constantine's issuing of his Milan decree, 313 A.D., the contemporary Eusebius had referred to the Diocletian persecutions as a *θεία κρίσις*, a divine judgment. (See E. G. Sihler: *From Augustus to Augustine*, 1923, p. 207.)

The Church of Jesus and the World—a grave and urgent theme at this moment. How often have not state churches been saved from themselves by secession, or dissent in some form! Wicliff, Savonarola, Huss, Wesley, and Luther—their lives and work were, or implied, indictments of a church which had become merely a secularized form of sacerdotal and utterly unspiritual tyranny practiced over human society from the cradle to the grave, and beyond to Purgatory.

The most sympathetic portion of Dr. Cadoux's book, for the present reviewer, is the Epilogue. I will, I believe, serve

both the work and also the readers of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW by transcribing from that Epilogue, because it confronts and points to certain features in the question of world and church as they now at this moment actually are:

"Today all that has been long changed. The claimants to the Christian name comprise so many and such different types of creed, polity and ethic, that mutual recognition between different groups is in many cases withheld; *and there is no longer any one solid, comprehensive, and easily recognizable, if imperfect, Christian phalanx facing the forces of worldliness and materialism.* The spirit of the world *has eaten deep into the vitals of the Christian commonwealth,* so much so, that the charge can be made, not justifiably indeed, but at least without obvious absurdity, that the average moral life within the Church is as much the home of lazy reactionism and selfishness as it is of idealism and progress." (P. 618. Italics mine.)

Of the "natural goodness of the human heart" I have grave doubts—it needs no St. Paul to tell us. Natural admiration of goodness (in others) would be truer to the long empiricist preachment of our human kind. I appeal to the conscience of every one, turning to the Perfect One's mediation, *im Kaemmerlein*, as Luther was wont to say. Christ is more than an ideal—one which deepens in all honest hearts the sense of their infinite remoteness from Him; He is, thanks be to God, the Redeemer of a sinful world. I quote a stanza of Martin Luther's:

Der Sohn des Vaters,
Gott von Art,
Ein Gast in der Welt hier ward,
Und fuehrt uns aus dem Iammerthal
Er macht uns Erben in Sein'm Saal.

The Index to Dr. Cadoux's book is one of the very best I have met with in a long life of reading. One odd thing I will not leave unmentioned; Antinous is called a "friend" of the Emperor Hadrian!

E. G. SIHLER.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS MYSTICISM ⁴

THIS book appears as one in the series of the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method; and for this reason it starts with a very impressive scientific backing. Moreover upon its own merits it is sure to win a very wide circle of friends and to take its place among the most authoritative books upon religious mysticism. It is a book that will henceforth have to be reckoned with by every sincere and thorough student of the psychology of religion. There is no use trying to discount the fact, Professor Leuba here has stated the issue between the different schools in the field of psychology and religious education in terms which cannot be misunderstood, and which must be faced.

He casually informs his readers that the real problems of unbelief no longer center around the inner beliefs of the Christian church, such as the Virgin Birth and like doctrines; they go much deeper than this, to the very heart of religious experience itself. The palsy which has stricken Christian faith, he informs his readers, has its seat in the fact that the scientific analysis of the psychology of religious experience proves that the experience of the sense of presence of a personal God, of divine guidance, and all of the extreme and modified religious experiences of ecstasy which run from "full union" with God to common worship, are discovered to be of subjective birth, and can be traced to purely human origin. And, if one allows Professor Leuba to select and interpret the data of religious experience, his conclusion is inevitable. Before we admit the validity of his conclusion, however, it will be wise to examine a little more closely the process by which he reaches it.

Every good play needs a villain in action somewhere in its plot to create the proper contrasts and reactions. In fact, the villain is one of the most indispensable and useful members of the cast. There are certain things that need to be said and

⁴The Psychology of Religious Mysticism. By James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology, Bryn Mawr College. Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc. 1925. Pp. xii+336.

done which no other character in the play can be expected to say or do. For this reason the villain serves to supply this need. From the dramatic standpoint, from the very first of his entrance upon the stage in the field of psychology of religion, Professor Leuba has played this role in the drama which this branch of psychology has been enacting for the benefit of the world and the church. And we must confess that he plays his part well and improves with the years.

His first appearance was in 1896, when he published his degree thesis on Conversion in *The American Journal of Psychology*. It was followed soon by an article on The Moral Imperative, which is found in volume VII of this journal. A fairly detailed analysis of this work is contained in the reviewer's book, *Acute and Chronic Unbelief*, in the chapter, *The Chronic Unbeliever*. Any one who will take the trouble to read these two early studies will find that they gave full promise of what the future would bring forth. For they show the author occupying the exact positions which are worked out with such thoroughness in this latest book. Therefore the reader must bear in mind, that these conclusions are not the result of thirty years of patient study in this field, but that the author started with these conclusions and has spent thirty years of his life in a determined effort to substantiate them scientifically. The motivated-will-to-think, selective attention, and the will-to-believe have had a fair opportunity to show what they can do to the thinking mechanism of the human organism. Naturally one would not expect Professor Leuba to disprove in his own mental functioning these fundamental laws of modern psychology; and he has not. On the contrary, he has demonstrated that these laws can be depended upon to function unfailingly even in the mind of one of his psychological knowledge and eminence. This is a great gain for psychology.

The book starts with the theory, that originally drugs and mechanical means were the source of that ecstasy which is at the heart of all religious experience. Among the non-civilized peoples these means served the purpose, but as man gradually

evolved, there came the dawn of the spiritual conception of the divine. From the moment that this spiritual conception of the divine dawned, the use of drugs and purely mechanical means for creating the ecstasy began to grow in disfavor. Upon this point the author writes:

"These grossly material methods are incongruous with the spiritual conception of the gods. Furthermore, they produce after-effects which, because disagreeable or debasing, or both, cannot easily be reconciled with the theory of god-possession." (P. 16.)

Then he continues:

"Yet, ecstatic states are too delightful, too wonderful; they gratify too many deep needs to be given up. Therefore it was that, groping in the dark, men gradually evolved a method of ecstasy apparently consistent with a higher conception of divine nature: the *psychical* method." (P. 16.)

After an interesting study of the drug and mechanical methods of inducing ecstasy, the author studies the method of producing this state by the Yoga system of mental concentration. Then Christian mysticism is studied, and he shows that the physiological and psychological experiences of the Christian mystics are identical with those of the drug-user and the Yoga devotees. To prove this point he selects a few of the most outstanding Christian mystics, such as Catherine of Genoa, Mme. Guyon, Santa Theresa, St. Marguerite Marie, Mlle. Vé. He then studies the temperamental dispositions and environmental incentives to hysteria and neurasthenia and finds that these are operative in the great mystics.

From this point Professor Leuba moves on to study Ecstasy, Religious and Otherwise. This comparative study will be of interest to those who are not familiar with this phase of the problem, and when his study of trance-consciousness is added, the reader will begin to realize that he has rendered a service in handling so frankly these questions. With his analysis of the Sense of Invisible Presence and Divine Guidance, he brings the strictly psychological portion of his book to an end.

The conclusion to which he brings his reader is, that there is no objective reality to the religious experience which is at the heart of Christian worship, the sense of divine guidance and the existence of a personal God. All of these religious experiences are explained as illusory. They are purely subjective creations.

The reader may gain some idea of his method of explanation by a glance at his analysis of the Motivation of Christian Mysticism. The psychological factors which stimulate these experiences are reduced to five, and are thus given:

"1. The tendencies to self-affirmation and the need for self-esteem.

"2. The tendencies to cherish, to devote oneself to something or somebody. These tendencies come to their most perfect expression in the parents' relations with the utterly dependent child but strange as it may seem, they appear even in man's relations with God.

"3. The needs for affection and moral support.

"4. The need for peace, for single-mindedness or unity, both in passivity and in action.

"5. 'Organic' needs or needs for sensuous satisfaction (especially in connexion with the sex-life). If the mystics profess disdain for the body and its pleasures, it is not because they are indifferent to sensuous delight as such, but because they see some incompatibility between the pleasures of the flesh and the soul's welfare. When they are not aware of the bodily origin of sensuous enjoyment, they give themselves up to it with great relish and complete abandon." (P. 116 f.)

Out of these tendencies and needs there come the full motivation of the Christian mystical experiences, from the extremes of the great mystics to the mystical experiences of common worship. Of these tendencies and needs the "organic," or sex-impulse, is featured as one of the most potent. In fact it overshadows all of the others in the author's treatment. One quotation in passing will bring this fact out. The author remarks:

"Not one of the prominent representatives of mysticism lived a normal married life. The kind of love bestowed by them upon God and Christ is apparently incompatible with normal conjugal relations." (P. 119.)

It should be remembered at this point that his previous identification of these tendencies and needs as satisfied by drugs would lead to the conclusion that drug addicts are motivated by the same psychological urges. This being true, one would be forced to seek for the motives which drive men to drugs and drink in the want of normal married life. But in this realm this becomes an effect not a cause. Of course, if a student should select his subjects for psychological study with as much discernment and care as Professor Leuba has his mystics, it might be proven that the cause of all addiction to drugs and drink and immorality is the want of a normal married life. But the student who would take into consideration all of the data would have to add other causes.

It should also be kept in mind, that drugs and mechanical means of inducing ecstasy leave their victims in a very different physical, psychological, and moral condition from that which Christian mysticism produces. For even Professor Leuba admits that, whatever may have been the condition of these mystics when they began their quest for "union with God," when they finally attained it they were sent back into the world to work for Him and the establishment of His Kingdom upon this earth with a zeal and self-sacrificing spirit that drugs and mechanical methods never produce. In the field of the science of medicine the fact that a course of treatment kills instead of cures is ground for suspecting that there is some difference in the medicine. This difference of results Professor Leuba entirely ignores when analyzing the mystical experiences of ecstasy. The very fact, that the Christian religion can take hold of lives as disorganized as those of these mystics when they turned from the world to it for help and so reorganize them as to produce the transformed persons they became, is a very important factor in the experience which seems to have made little impression upon Professor Leuba. But we will waive this question, and turn to the main issue.

Professor Leuba evidently feels that he has by this study of the psychology of mysticism undermined the very founda-

tions upon which the religious experience rests, as the last two chapters show. But the validity of his conclusions hangs upon the question whether he has reached the heart of the problem. Has he proven that the psychological foundations upon which the Christian religious experience rest are unfounded? Or has he simply proven that the psychological foundations *which he has assumed as those upon which this experience rests* are unfounded? To avoid any suspicion that we will do him any injustice, we will allow the author to make his own confession.

"Is it claimed that this investigation amounts to a proof of the non-existence of God? It amounts in the author's opinion to no more than a demonstration of the total insufficiency of the ground on which rests, on the whole, the belief in the existence of the gods of the religions. Of other conceptions of God or gods this book speaks only incidentally, and without definitely offering any conclusion." (P. 317.)

Now we are as ready to concede this point as Professor Leuba, provided that it is first proven that the grounds for these beliefs are those which Professor Leuba in this study assumes. We believe that it can be easily proven that he has not correctly stated these grounds of belief. There are factors within the Christian religious experience of which he has taken no recognition, and forces for which he has made no provision. Not only this, but the real constructive factor in the problem he has left untouched. Here is his own confession:

"We have not presumed to say how the *ultimate* source of the new energies by which the mystic is enriched is to be conceived. We have limited ourselves to the affirmation that there are in the human being innate sources of energy, customarily spoken of as innate tendencies or instinct and regarded as dependent upon or connected with the presence of physiological (neural) mechanisms. And we have added that physical and moral health, and with them happiness, depend upon an adequate stimulation and an harmonious manifestation of these sources of energy." (P. 317.)

This confession leaves us just where we started, as to the main question at issue. Many years ago Professor James raised this problem in this memorable passage:

"Such cases [the mystics] taken along with others which would be too tedious for quotation, seem sufficiently to prove the existence in our mental machinery of a sense of present reality more diffused and general than that which our special senses yield. For the psychologists the tracing of the organic seat of such a feeling would form a pretty problem." (*Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 63. Quoted by Professor Leuba, p. 293.)

Professor Leuba has indeed made an interesting study of many of the secondary problems involved in this study, but he has not touched upon the real problem he started to explore, which is the "organic seat" of the religious experience, the "ultimate source of the new energies which come into the life of the religious person" as the result of Christian experience. He surrenders at the point where the whole issue rests. We will conclude with one statement which gives his whole case away:

"Our argument leads to a question of fact: is the belief in God, or are the beliefs in gods which have made possible the historical religions due entirely or essentially to an animistic interpretation of particular physical phenomena and of the phenomena of 'inner' experience?" (p. 301 f.).

This he follows out thus:

"If it should turn out that the beliefs in the gods which make possible the religions, as they have existed and as they exist to-day, come from the naïve interpretation of certain phenomena—whether physical or psychical—then *those beliefs* would disappear together with that interpretation" (p. 301).

This is the question to be settled. And we are quite astonished to find Professor Leuba, at this late date, taking the chance of risking his case upon the ancient animistic theory of the origin of religious experience and the belief in the existence of an objective God. For we have advanced far beyond this theory today, and have been forced to this position by the new facts brought to light within the field of psychology. Anyone who has read Koffka's book on *The Growth of the Mind* and Otto's book on *The Idea of the Holy* will find that, both in the

realm of psychology and in that of psychology of religion, this theory was left behind long ago. Thirty years ago, when Professor Leuba came to accept his present position upon this subject, this theory might have stood some show of sustaining his argument. But today it leaves his whole position without any sound psychological foundation. So we may turn his own argument back upon him, and say: If the *unbeliefs* in the existence of an objective, personal God and in the reality of the religious experience of worship as it is practiced by the Christian church today should be found to come from a naïve interpretation of certain phenomena—whether physical or psychical—then *those unbeliefs* would disappear together with that interpretation.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

SCIENCE AS REVELATION ⁵

IT is an interesting fact, and perhaps not without significance in more directions than one, that the author of this book is himself neither a scientist nor a theologian, but the administrative head of a large business concern. His book speaks well for the breadth of his intellectual interests, the range of his reading, at least along certain lines, and for his gifts as a writer. His style is simple and clear, with only occasional infelicities that call for no special mention.

Judging from his book, he is a man of poetic temperament, irenic spirit, and moral earnestness. The dedication of his book and the opening paragraphs of its preface contain autobiographical hints that throw light, not only on the characteristics of the author just mentioned and others yet to be noticed, but also on the origin and purpose of his book. The dedication reads: "To my mother who taught me to love the good and true; and to my father who taught me to think for myself." If the maternal influence shows itself in certain of the characteristics already mentioned, it is doubtless the paternal influ-

⁵ Science as Revelation. By John M. Watson. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 303. Illustrations.

ence that accounts for a certain quiet cock-sureness that is constantly in evidence. This is so natural and naïve in its manifestations as to be positively engaging.

It does not tend, however, to win the confidence of the wary reader to find the author saying with the emphasis of italics: "The production of *absolutely new species* of life has been achieved by Luther Burbank over and over again" (p. 143). Nor is the reader's attitude materially modified by the fact that the author says this upon the express assurance of Mr. Burbank himself. Nor is the effect different in the case of such facile logic as this: "Since natural laws are infinite, eternal and unchangeable, it follows as a necessary conclusion that, wherever heavenly bodies have advanced to that point of similarity to the earth in the elements of which they are composed and in their chemical organization that life *can* come into being, life *must* come into being" (p. 38).

The opening paragraphs of the Preface, above referred to, read:

"Since my boyhood I have had a growing conviction that the truths of nature must constitute a dependable revelation of the Divine way and will.

"For nearly twenty years under the instruction of a most devout and sincere minister of the gospel, I reached the years of my majority well grounded in orthodoxy. But at the same time I became interested in the study of nature, and then and since I have delved delightfully in the sciences. As I have learned more and more of the facts of nature I have learned to depend more and more upon natural law as the sure and safe expression of the Infinite Will. . . .

"I have a growing conviction that the moral or religious impulse has a truly scientific basis, and that our creeds can be refined and purified to harmonize with the truths of nature." (P. 7.)

These statements clearly indicate the origin and the purpose of Mr. Watson's book. Thinking for himself, delving in the sciences, he has come upon a "New Revelation," in the use of which he essays to refine and purify the creeds, to harmonize

them "with the truths of nature" as those truths are conceived and expounded by himself, and so to provide mankind with a new religion.

If this seems a somewhat ambitious undertaking, we have only to remind ourselves that men today are as seriously and as absorbedly engaged in the "making" of religions as were the hypothetical "primitive men" who figure so largely in present day speculation. The business of "god making" is as active today as it was when Isaiah directed against it the shafts of his deadly satire.

A glance at the table of contents of Mr. Watson's book will reveal the fact that his program for commending his "New Religion" and "New Revelation" to our acceptance is not a whit less ambitious than the goal he has set before himself. In a word, he presents his "New Religion" and his "New Revelation" as conclusions demanded by a generalization based upon the findings of science, ethics, and philosophy. The table of contents reads: "Introduction, The Astronomer Speaks, The Physicist Speaks, The Chemist Speaks, The Biologist Speaks, The Geologist Speaks, The Paleontologist Speaks, The Anthropologist Speaks, The Voice of Ethics, The Philosopher Speaks, The New Religion, The New Revelation." Each chapter, except the first and the last, has as its sub-caption: "Law, Order, Cosmos, God." The third chapter opens with the words: "In the beginning God. Strictly speaking in the language of the physicist—in the beginning, Energy." (P. 47.) Near the close of the chapter, in italics, we read: "*The original energy was the creative force*" (p. 74). Similar statements occur at the end of succeeding chapters, except the last two. Accordingly, we are not surprised to find that the god of Mr. Watson's "New Religion" and "New Revelation" is "Energy." Thus he says:

"The astronomer's God of creation is Energy. . . . The God of creation of the physicist is Energy. . . . The God of creation of the biologist is Energy. . . . In short, science finds that all things that are known to exist on the earth or throughout the universe have been produced by the expenditure of energy. The God of all creation is Energy." (P. 272 f.)

To the obviously and fundamentally important question, But what can we infer from what it does concerning the nature of the energy that creates all substance, brings about the changes observed in all matter and throughout the universe? Mr. Watson's answer is:

"The astronomer can explain the birth, life, destruction, and resurrection of worlds, but his telescopes have never found the birth-place of the original energy or matter embodied in them. However, he does observe everywhere throughout the universe the existence of something to which language best approximates by the term Universal Intelligence." (P. 270.)

In a previous connection, however, Mr. Watson has insisted that human intelligence is but one mode of manifestation of physical energy, as truly and in the same sense as water with all of its wonderful properties is a mode of manifestation of this same primal "energy." "Intelligence," therefore, even when written with a capital I and preceded by the large adjective "Universal" is but one of the infinite variety of manifestations of "energy or matter" due solely and inevitably to differing molecular structure and arrangement.

"These be thy gods, O Israel!" according to the "New Revelation" and the "New Religion." "The New Religion," Mr. Watson tells us, "is therefore the religion of the *fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, and a universe that is the home of them both. It is the Religion of Universal Truth.*" (P. 205.) But even if Mr. Watson's "New Religion" were new, as everybody must know that it is not, still, in the light of what "The Astronomer," "The Physicist," "The Chemist," and the others have told us, speaking of course through Mr. Watson, what Mr. Watson now says of it sounds like grave irony. The fatherhood of "energy or matter," the brotherhood of "atoms" and "molecules," and a universe that of necessity is what it is, the home of them both! Such, when stripped of ideas borrowed from Christianity, is in reality Mr. Watson's "New Religion."

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

AN ELEMENTARY CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY⁶

THERE is a widespread demand for some book on elementary Christian psychology to place in the hands of religious teachers and workers who have had no opportunity for special study in this popular and important branch of science. In response to this keenly felt need, the Board of Elementary Christian Education of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America arranged with Professor Norlie for the preparation and publication of a book of this character. In the Foreword, the committee appointed for this purpose make the following statement:

"The Board of Elementary Christian Education of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America has keenly felt the need of an elementary work on psychology presenting that subject from a Biblical point of view, and it is therefore with a great deal of pleasure that it is now able to present such a volume to the pastors, Sunday School superintendents, and teachers in our Sunday Schools and other schools of elementary Christian education."

Then they add:

"The author is so generally known throughout our Church for his broad scholarship, painstaking care, and faithfulness to Scripture and the Lutheran confessions that he needs no introduction."

With such a cordial commendation by the committee, this book should enjoy a very wide circulation within the denomination of the author.

Professor Norlie informs his readers that he has made a very exhaustive study of the whole field of psychology and psychology of religion in preparation for this work. We will allow him to give this information in his own words:

"Text books in psychology, of which 1,200, written by 1,000 different authors, have been read or examined. As to subject matter, these source books cover every known field and

⁶ An Elementary Christian Psychology. By Olaf Morgan Norlie, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Psychology, Luther College. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House. 1925. Pp. 270.

method of psychology, and are written from every angle. As to place of writing, 50 per cent were produced in America, 20 per cent in Great Britain, 20 per cent in Germany and Scandinavia and 10 per cent in 29 other lands. As to time of writing, 60 per cent are recent books, published since 1900, and 40 per cent are distributed over the preceding 25 centuries. The author has freely seasoned his own lines with quotations from these and other sources and has given at the end of each chapter brief reference lists, in order to give credit for the quotations and to encourage the reader to further study." (P. 5.)

As the above statement indicates, the author has spared no pains to make himself familiar with his subject. And he has equipped his book with a very valuable and full bibliography. If Dr. Norlie does not hold to the modern point of view in his conception of human personality, it is not because he is ignorant of it, but because, in his judgment, it is not sound.

In addition to these items of interest, the book contains a surprisingly large number of charts illustrating the physiological and psychological subjects under consideration. These charts, so far as they pertain to the body-mind problem are borrowed, with the consent of publishers, from standard works, and are very satisfactory. Professor Norlie devotes considerable space to the body-mind problems. For example, chapter 2 is entitled, Connection between Body and Soul. Here these current theories concerning this relation are discussed: Idealism, Materialism, Double Aspect Theory, Parallelism, Incarcerationism, Interactionism. He also considers The Influence of the Body upon the Soul; further, The Influence of the Soul upon the Body. In chapter 3, he discusses The Physiological Foundations of the Heart; and in chapter 4, The Physiological Foundations of the Head, with full consideration of the problems of the nervous system. In these chapters the physiological charts are used.

In the part of the book devoted to the study of psychology he has a chapter on Psychical Foundations. Here consciousness and attention are considered. Then he has three chapters on Knowing. This faculty, for he adopts the faculty division, is

separated into Presentation, Intuition, Sensation, Perception, Representation, Association, Memory, Imagination, Thinking, Conception, Judging. Charts are made by the author, showing the relations of these features of knowing to each other, and to knowing as a whole. Next follow a chapter on Feeling and another on Willing.

Up to this point we have been within the field of general psychology, and have not yet entered into the field of psychology of religion. Fully half the book is devoted to laying the psychological foundation upon which the superstructure of Christian psychology is to be builded. Having laid such a substantial foundation, designed at every point for the type of superstructure to be erected upon it, we are not surprised to find that the superstructure fits the foundation exactly, and that the foundation is adapted to hold the superstructure. Perhaps it will be wise to pause for a moment at this point to take a look at the foundation which has been laid in psychology for his superstructure of Christian psychology.

As has already been stated, Professor Norlie adopts the faculty conception of personality. He says: "We hold with the Bible and common sense that man has a soul and this soul has faculties, or powers" (p. 241). The faculties of the soul he enumerates as five: Thinking, Feeling, Willing, Conscience, and Faith. Upon this point he remarks:

"Every human being, then, even in his natural corrupt state, has not only the faculties of knowing, feeling and willing, but also a moral faculty (conscience), and a religious faculty (faith)" (p. 162 f.).

Having thus equipped the soul with these faculties, he has his human being perfectly adapted to the system of religion and plan of salvation found in Luther's confessions of faith and the Bible. He has been very careful from the start not to conflict at any point with these authorities. For he thus frankly informs the reader at the outset that this is his plan:

"This book employs the method and material of philosophy and science wherever these do not conflict with the clear teach-

ings of the Bible, the revealed, inspired, authoritative and infallible Word of God. While the Bible is not a text book of psychology, it is, on many points, the best and last source." (P. 25.)

It is interesting, in this age, to find a writer so familiar with the whole field of psychology, and yet holding tenaciously to the older faculty psychology, and accepting the Biblical interpretation of the nature of man. The rejection of the modern position is here the result of the author's judgment that the strongest position is the one to which he adheres. Those religious teachers and leaders who hold his position and are seeking for a text book on Christian psychology will find this a very serviceable volume. And those who do not share the author's point of view will do well to read this very clear statement of a position which, perhaps, they never have seen effectively presented. The clearness with which every problem is stated, analyzed, and solved, is a splendid example to the modern thinker who leaves so many problems hazy. If both points of view could be stated with the same clearness, it would make it much easier for their merits to be estimated. The reviewer believes that this little book has a real place of usefulness. Not only for those who hold the point of view of the author, but for those who differ from him, and yet can be helped by his excellent presentation of the older position.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.